PUBLICATIONS OF THE IPSWICH HISTORICAL SOCIETY
XXVII

PURITAN HOMES

By SHERMAN L. WHIPPLE
and THOMAS FRANKLIN WATERS

Printed for the Historical Society
1929

Ipswich Public Library
Ipswich, Massachusetts

PUBLICATIONS OF THE IPSWICH
HISTORICAL SOCIETY
XXVII

PURITAN HOMES

By SHERMAN L. WHIPPLE
and THOMAS FRANKLIN WATERS

Printed for the Historical Society
1929

NEWCOMB & GAUSS CO.
Printers
SALEM, MASS.

WHIPPLE HOUSE, HOME OF THE IPSWICH HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Ipswich Public Library
Ipswich, Massachusetts

FOREWORD

For the first time in the history of the Society we find ourselves confronted by a new problem: What shall we publish for the next number of the Society's Proceedings? Shall it be an original pamphlet, the material for which is in hand in manuscript form, or shall it be a reproduction of a previous number which has had a most favorable reception?

The first edition of Number Five of the Society's Proceedings has been exhausted, and although it indicates a departure from the usual line of procedure, repeated inquiries and requests for this particular number have been so insistent that it has been decided to publish another edition of this pamphlet in lieu of adding another original number to an already extended list.

Moreover it seems fitting and proper that some consideration be shown those friends of the Society whose loyalty and continued interest have given it a permanent place among our historical and educational institutions.

Again, the favorable opinion in which the works of Mr. Waters are still held, their absolute dependability, is an evidence of the appreciation and kindly esteem of which the man and his works are so justly deserving. This tendency and estimation should be encouraged and strengthened by every possible means. He wrote with high purpose. Long and patiently he toiled that a truthful record of the past might be preserved for this and coming generations. Any failure to seize the opportunity, so favorably presented, to renew our acknowledgments of the great value of the work and influence of this man, would be a breach of trust.

These are a few of the considerations that decided our course of action. Another original number will be published at such time as the best interests of the Society may determine.

The Second Part of Number Five, Old Houses of Ipswich, will be enlarged and enriched in this second edition by the address of Sherman L. Whipple, Esq., of Boston, given at the rededication of the Whipple House in September of this year.

The address itself is directly in line with Mr. Waters' work and furnishes a valuable supplement to this number. It is worthy of an honored place in any historical collection and will be read with no little interest. It deals with an individual house, or better, with a remarkable home which sheltered a coterie of men and women whose sturdy character it would be hard to duplicate in all the hosts of our New England forebears. He portrays with fidelity and rare skill the exalted character of the men and women who, under times of great stress, laid so wisely and so securely the foundations of the form of government which we now enjoy. He is no apologist for the Puritan influence. He deals courageously and justly with those fundamental principles which were the groundwork of the Puritan thought and action. All honor to him and to all those whose breadth of view enables them to recognize and appreciate at its true value the Puritan spirit which overcame tyranny, and whose dominating influence has been seen and felt even down to the present time. Let those who have better served even their present day and generation cast the first stone.

When the removal of the Whipple House to its present location was under consideration, objections and protests were numerous and bitter. Dire results were predicted to befall not only the House but the Society itself. But a mawkish sentiment found no place in the deliberation of the Society, and it was voted that the House be moved to the site donated for that purpose by Mr. R. T. Crane, Jr.

In its present location the House occupies a position near the South Church where Mr. Waters labored as its pastor for more than a quarter of a century, thus

grouping his work in a closer relationship than would otherwise have been possible. This incident alone has something of a sentimental value.

The House has been rebuilt throughout and will last through another century. Its patronage during the past season exceeded that of any three former years. More than all that, it occupies the exact site of the old Choate Mansion, a famous hostelry of ye ancient time. The line of the old cellar wall and that of the new are identical. The same door-stone that resounded to the footfall of convivial guests serves a soberer purpose for the Whipple House. The old and the new have been brought together. Each promotes and preserves the interests of the other. A happier combination would be difficult of realization — a fine home, beautifully situated; a monument to the men and women of long ago.

ADDRESS AT THE RE-DEDICATION EXERCISES OF THE WHIPPLE HOUSE

By Sherman L. Whipple, Esq.

We are met here for the re-dedication of an ancient house — one of the oldest, I believe, now existing in our country; a house, — a part of it at least — that dates back to the very beginnings of New England.

The occasion is one of interest to all of us because of our general interest in the history of New England which this house reflects; to some of us because their ancestors here were born, lived their lives and died; to still others because their forebears, nearly three centuries ago, were guests or familiars within its walls. I am of this latter class;—for I am not — as has been said in some recent press notices of this occasion — a lineal descendant of the Whipple who first occupied this house.

Of the two brothers, Matthew and John, who were settled in Ipswich sometime prior to 1638, I am descended from Matthew. It is John, his younger brother, who was the earliest proprietor of the "Whipple House."

While, therefore, I may not claim the close interest of a lineal descent from those who created the "Whipple House," I am none the less proud as a kinsman to be here, and am most grateful for the gracious invitation of my fellow-members of the Ipswich Historical Society to speak as a representative of the Whipple Clan. It is a privilege which I greatly appreciate to join in these exercises with others who are interested in the house and in its history, and it quite thrills me to walk in these rooms where for more than a century my ancestors visited their kin and where for more than two centuries my kinsfolk walked in their daily vocations.

As to the house itself, its original building, its additions, its restoration, or, indeed, of its owners or occu-

pants, there is little I can add that is new. Mr. Waters has covered these matters in his admirable books and pamphlets which concern the early history of Ipswich and especially the activities around the Whipple House. I suspect that no building in America has ever been more thoroughly investigated or its history written with such care and accuracy as is the case with this home of the Historical Society by Mr. Waters. We are all of us deeply in debt to him for the really unique work he did in this connection and for his contribution to our knowledge of Ipswich and her early settlers.

It may not be amiss, however, in passing to remind ourselves that the first grant of the lot on which the Whipple House was erected appears to have been to John Fawn, who perhaps built a portion of the house which the Society now owns. Fawn, however, left Ipswich at an early date and figured but little in her history. John Whipple was in occupancy of the structure then on the lot as early, at least, as 1642, and some of his descendants occupied the house continuously thereafter until as late as 1833.

The original Whipples of Ipswich, Matthew and John, came to this country from Bocking, near Ipswich in England, at some date between 1636 and 1638. They were sons of Matthew, who was a cloth manufacturer — described in those days as a "clothier." They were a part of the great migration of the English that occurred in the early years of the Seventeenth Century — a migration which has proved to be perhaps the most notable and important in the world's history — certainly the most notable that ever occurred from the "tight little Isle."

Its causes, until a comparatively recent date, have been little understood here in New England. Most of us, I think, have assumed that the reason of the migration was religious persecution in England, and that the purpose of the emigrants was to secure religious liberty. This has been constantly asserted in books and speeches. It has been the learning, even, of public schools.

But more recent historical research has disclosed that economic reasons were vastly more cogent than religious in causing the migration. I must confess that to me, reared in the old traditions of religious oppression in England, under an Established Church, and the Puritan Fathers seeking religious liberty in a land of hardship, the facts stated in Dr. James Truslow Adams *The Founding of New England,* came as a distinct surprise. The figures and historic documents which he cites are, however, convincing.

The great migration had already begun at a considerable period before the Pilgrims landed in Plymouth, and in its beginnings evidently had no relation whatever to Puritanism or religious differences. When Winthrop came to Massachusetts Bay, some 17,000 English had already settled more or less permanently on the shore line of the North American Continent, and many thousand more in Bermuda and the West Indies.

Moreover, in 1640, when the English population in America and the West Indies had reached a total of 65,000, only 16,000 of these were Massachusetts Bay colonists; and of this number the astounding fact appears that only some 4,000 were sufficiently "Puritan" to have become members of the Puritan churches.

The fact appears to be clear, therefore, that generally speaking the causes of the migration were distinctly economic; and that while Puritans joined therein to a limited extent, this was due chiefly to the fact that they happened to reside in sections where the economic causes operated.

There can be no doubt, however, that many if not all the Puritans who joined the migration were measurably influenced to such action by the discomfort of their religious position at home and the hope of a freer religious life in a new land.

Moreover, the Puritans and their religious beliefs — or non-beliefs—and practices—or non-practices—were unpopular with the great majority in their native land,—

which lessened their prospects of advancement socially, politically and economically. They saw a better chance for themselves in a new land. This was undoubtedly so in the case of Winthrop, as appears by his correspondence (J. T. A. pp. 136, 137); and he, I think, may be regarded as fairly typical.

But the impressions which we have had that the migration was chiefly Puritan and for religious reasons, have been in a way justified. For the part of the migration which was Puritan was the single feature which has made the migration so notable in history. The migration to other points than New England — excepting only Virginia, amounting to some 50,000 souls, was in no way notable. It caused scarcely a ripple in the flow of world history. It was the settlement of some 16,000 in New England, dominated amazingly by the 4,000 who were strictly Puritans, that laid the foundations of what is now the first nation of the world, and that first laid out the form of government by a written constitution.

It is easy thus to understand why the Puritan migration, though so small in numbers, has so completely overshadowed historically the larger migration to other points.

It was the tide of this migration that swept Matthew and John Whipple from the home of their ancestors in England to Massachusetts Bay. Why they joined the migration is not recorded. We know, however, that from 1625 to 1630 "the business of the clothiers suffered a very severe decline which continued for some years" (p. 123).

That this economic situation was one cause of the Whipples' move to New England, is altogether likely; but it is unlikely that in the case of the Whipples, at least, this was the sole cause. Indeed, it may have been less moving than the religious situation, for both the brothers were Puritan. They were of the 4,000 in the migration who were distinctly Puritan, apparently intensely so. They were both members of the church

which was established at Ipswich, and thus members of that ecclesiastical oligarchy which constituted the government of Massachusetts. Of this church and government John was an important member. He was first a Deacon and later a Ruling Elder — the highest dignitary in the ecclesiastical and hence the governmental system, excepting only the Church Pastor.

By virtue of their church membership, both Matthew and John were recorded as freemen and thus entitled to vote upon governmental affairs in the town and colony, and to hold office.

From this influential position in the Church and therefore in civic and governmental affairs, with the aid of other records of his minor activities, we may perceive in outline the character of John Whipple, for whom, and perhaps in whose honor, the home of the Historical Society is named.

He was an Englishman — probably by long descent — and probably with the well-known characteristics of that race. He was of the middle class. In England he was a stubborn dissenter against the Established Church, — and we may assume out of sympathy with the existing government. In Massachusetts Bay he was a church leader and a part of those who dominated the secular government.

He was a deeply religious man — with that intense belief in a personal God, with whom he felt himself to be in close personal contact, that characterizes the Puritan belief.

He was a pure and upright man, and, if affected with the sternness of the Puritan, there are clear evidences that he was yet withal a kindly and affectionate man.

In all his activities his brother Matthew seems to have been closely associated with him, but John was the leading spirit. Here, again, John represented revolt against the venerable English institution of primogeniture. Although, as shown by their father's will, Matthew's share as eldest son was greater, John died

the richer man. John's position in Church and State was higher than his brother's. Consequently, John is recorded as Mr. John Whipple, Gentleman, while my ancestor Matthew held the humbler social position as "Goodman Matthew."

John was thorough. He built a house that has lasted through the centuries. Matthew's abode has not survived. Even by his descendants John was more distinguished; for his son John — known as Cornet John and Captain John — was a leading citizen of Ipswich, and died perhaps its wealthiest — probably among the richest of the Colony. His grandson, Major John, was a citizen and officer of distinction, and a descendant William was a General in the Revolutionary War, and a signer of the Declaration of Independence, while a descendant of Matthew served under him as a Captain of Town Militia and his son, in turn, as a private, in a march to check Burgoyne.

Ipswich in its early days seems to have been the habitation of many — and much frequented by many others — of distinguished men and women who made up the ecclesiastical oligarchy which dominated Massachusetts Bay.

It was founded by the younger Winthrop. It was resorted to by Governor Dudley; and there were the abodes of the Appletons, the Saltonstalls, the Bradstreets — including Anne, the first New England poetess — the Rogers, the Paines, the Denisons, the Dodges, the Lummuses, the Wards, the Symonds, the Nortons, and many others who have been leaders in New England church, political and social life.

These men were neighbors and friends of John Whipple. Doubtless all in their time were frequently within the walls of this ancient house of the Whipples.

John Whipple, while an associate of the first men of the Colony, was not apparently an effective and influential leader in its larger concerns. But in Ipswich he was a leader.

When Richard Saltonstall returned to England for a season, John Whipple was one of those chosen as his attorneys to manage his affairs in his absence.

John Rogers, his Pastor, later President of Harvard College, is described in John Whipple's will, in which he was named as one of the supervisors of its execution, as "my loving friend." William Hubbard, a graduate of Harvard and a pastor, the other supervisor, was also so described.

John Whipple himself was not a man of university training; but he seems to have associated with those who were, on equal terms and as an intimate friend. There are indications in his will and in other contemporary records that he lived — while modestly — quite as a gentleman, and that he was endowed with social graces.

His occupation was that of farming. He owned some 300 acres located at Ipswich Hamlet, — now Hamilton — from which he evidently derived a profit — as large, perhaps, as that of those who now laboriously till his acres in that favored town.

We are enabled thus, I think, in the revelations of this house in which he lived and in his will and inventory describing his property and belongings, and in the history of his times, to distinguish in outline the characteristics and qualities of Mr. John Whipple, Gentleman. It can be said of him that he was a Puritan of the Puritans, typifying, no doubt, in a general way, their virtues and their failings.

It seems to have been a fashion of recent years to speak lightly of the Puritan characteristics and qualities. No one, however, has arisen seriously to deny the merit of the Puritans' achievements, or their influence in shaping the institutions and destinies of our Nation; the tendency is rather to criticize the Puritan life and characteristics and to poke fun at many things the Puritan did.

It must be conceded that there are unlovely things in the early history and development of Puritanism in

New England, and in characteristics and qualities of some of the Puritans, but I believe them to have been exceptional, and as compared with the merits of Puritanism, greatly exaggerated.

Puritans may have been harsh and stern; they may have been opinionated, stubborn and conceited. They may have been even cruel. But these qualities — when they existed — concealed beneath, qualities which generally prevailed which were of the finest texture. They were among themselves affectionate, even loving. They were undemonstrative because emotionalism signified weakness. Their great characteristics were self-control and self-sacrifice; and upon these qualities high achievements are made and great nations are founded.

We have no self-revealing writing of John Whipple, Puritan — I now speak of him as a type, not the individual — but we do have a paper that reveals much of his character, and the characteristics and qualities of the Puritans who lived in this house and in this vicinage. It is to my mind one of the most fascinatingly revealing papers in respect of early Puritan days that has been brought to light. It is the letter of Sarah, youngest daughter of John Whipple, written under a strangely realized premonition that her death would occur at the birth of what proved to be her ninth and tenth children.

It is the letter of a woman who would be called a rare character in any age or era. It reflects fundamentally a deeply religious instinct. It carries lofty courage and fearlessness of death. It is filled with the spirit of self-sacrifice. It breathes with love of parents, of her husband and children, with affection for her friends and neighbors, and with adoration of God. It is touching in sentiment beyond words adequately to express. It reflects mental poise, moral purity, refinement of thought, and a cultural background. It reveals in their loftiest type the ideals of Puritanism and Puritan life.

Sarah Whipple Goodhue was born and reared in this house. She was a part of the family that made the

house what it was and is. Her presence sanctified it. The father of such a woman could not have been otherwise than godly, gentle, sweetly kind and loving. The letter reveals not only Sarah, the daughter, but John, the father, Susannah, the mother, and the type of Puritanism for which our house stands as a lasting memorial.

In this letter;—to her parents, she says:

"Honoured and most loving father and mother I cannot tell how to express your fatherly and motherly love towards me and mine: It hath been so great, and in several kinds; for the which in a poor requital, I give you hearty and humble thanks, yet trusting in God that he will enable you to be a father and mother to the motherless."

To her husband, she says:

"A tender-hearted, affectionate and entire loving husband thou hast been to me several ways. *****

This twenty years experience of thy love to me in this kind, hath so instamped it upon my mind, that I do think that there never was man more truly kind to a woman: I desire for ever to bless and praise the Lord, that in mercy to my soul, he by his providence ordered that I should live with thee in such a relation***."

In a most touchingly significant passage she sorrows that, dying, she will not be with her husband to sustain and comfort him in the impending loss of his wife.

"Be courageous," she invokes him, "and on the living God bear up thy heart in so great a breach as this."

To her children, she says:

"*My children*, one or two words I have to say to you more: in the first place, be sure to carry well to your father, obey him, love him, follow his instructions and example, be ruled by him, take his advice, and have a care of grieving him:****

My children, in your life and conversation, live godly, walk soberly, modestly, and innocently: be diligent, and be not hasty to follow new fashions, and the pride of life, that now too much abounds. Let not pride betray the good of your immortal souls."

This letter in itself, to my mind, not only exalts Puritanism to its proper place, but does honor to the parents to whom God sent this child as a priceless blessing.

Fortunate, indeed, is this Society to hold the house which centuries since was sanctified by so fine a presence.

THE EARLY HOMES OF THE PURITANS

[A paper read, March 6, 1897, before the Local History Class of the Essex Institute.]

By Thomas Franklin Waters

THE HOUSES

Peculiar pathos attaches to the landing of the Pilgrims at Plymouth, when winter was already abroad, their hasty building of their humble homes, and the prolonged suffering from cold, scant food, and sickness until summer came. But the settlement of the towns of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, Salem, Ipswich, and the rest, presents no such pitiful picture. To these points came an orderly migration of gentle folk and artisans, direct from their comfortable English homes, with much of their belongings, no doubt. The arrival of the ships that bore them was timed so well that they came upon our coast when the air was sweet with flowers and the fragrance of the wild strawberries. The long days of summer afforded them opportunity for building comfortable homes, and settling themselves into their new life, before the ordeal of winter came. In our thoughtlessness we banish hardship and suffering from the annals of this fortunate colony.

We are encouraged in this rosy dream of the first days by the reputed antiquity of many houses still remaining, wearing an air of comfort still, with their low, broad roofs, their huge chimney-stacks, suggestive of generous fireplaces within, their small windows, planned to admit a sufficiency of light and a modicum of cold, and their ample size. These ancient mansions, we are told date from the very earliest years of the settlement, perchance even from the year of the founding of the town, and accepting the date with confiding credulity, straightway we build many similar edifices in our imagination, and house the daring pioneers very luxuriously.

The striking incongruity of such mansions as these, and the rough pioneer life in the unbroken wilderness, should be enough to make us skeptical. Any careful study of the historic data will effectually disprove the truth of this claim of age. No less than five ancient dwellings in old Ipswich have been declared by many to date from 1633 or 1634. I have made diligent research in our Town Records and at the Registry of Deeds and Wills, and have come to the conclusion that two of them were built about 1700, the third about 1670-1680, and in the case of the two others the disproval of the reputed ownership removes the presumption of an antiquity which is not suggested by their architecture.

We shall make much nearer approach to the truth in our ideal, we may presume, if we remember always that our forefathers were invading a wilderness, and that of necessity their first houses were small, rude, and quickly built, so that they might give their first summer chiefly to clearing the land of forest, and raising some crop to furnish their food for the long, cold winter.

Edward Johnson, in his "Wonder Working Providence," portrays the experiences that he had known personally, incident to these settlements. "After they have found out a place of aboad," he writes, "they burrow themselves in the earth for their first shelter, under some hill side, casting the earth aloft upon timber; they make a smoaky fire against the earth at the highest side, and thus these poor servants of Christ provide shelter for themselves, their wives and little ones, keeping off the short showers from their lodgings, but the long rains penetrate through to their grate disturbance in the night season, yet in these poor wigwams they sing Psalms, pray, and praise their God, till they can provide them homes, which ordinarily was not wont to be with many till the Earth, by the Lord's blessing, brought forth bread to feed them, their wives and little ones."

Such a tale of woe may seem incredible to us. The

skilled woodsman can build a summer camp impervious to rain, and full of comfort, in a few hours, with no other tool than his axe. I have a pleasant acquaintance with a Rangeley guide of long experience, who always amazes me with stories of the facility with which a warm and comfortable camp can be fashioned in the deep snow in the thick forests, when the cold is intense, and of the palatial comfort of the log-camp, chinked with moss, covered deeply with snow and warmed with a roaring fire.

But these ancient Puritans were not woodsmen. They were gentlemen in part, and weavers, tailors, blacksmiths, coopers, brickmakers, carpenters and farmers. What knew they of the cunning art of woodcraft? So, I trow, that not only their dug-out in the hill-side, but often their humble cabin, was not sufficient for comfortable warmth. Such was the experience of the Deputy Governor Thomas Dudley, who wrote from Cambridge in 1630. "I thought fit to commit to memory our present condition, and what hath befallen us since our arrival here, which I will do shortly, after my usual manner, and must do rudely, having yet no table, nor other room to write in than by the fireside, upon my knee, in this sharp winter, to which my family must have leave to resort though they break good manners, and make me many times forget what I would say, and say what I would not."

If there was such scant comfort in the homes of their gentry, what was the lot of the poorest? Rough, simple houses, they must have been. There were no mills to saw their lumber. Every board was sawed by the tedious toil of two sawyers, one working in a saw pit. Every joist was hewed four square with the axe, every nail, bolt, hinge and latch, was hammered out by the blacksmith on his anvil. Brick chimneys and shingled roofs were rare.

Our surmise as to the style of their dwelling is confirmed by indubitable record. Matthew Whipple lived

on the corner of the present County and Summer streets, in Ipswich, near Miss Sarah Caldwell's present residence. In the inventory of his estate made in 1645, his dwelling house, barn and four acres of land, were appraised at £36, and six bullocks were valued at the same figure. His executors sold the dwelling with an acre of ground on the corner, in 1648, to Robert Whitman for £5. Whitman sold this property, and another house and lot, to William Duglass, cooper, for £22, in 1652. John Anniball, or Annable, bought the dwelling, barn, and two acres of land, on the eastern corner of Market and Summer streets, then called Annable's Lane, for £39, in 1647. Joseph Morse was a man of wealth and social standing. His inventory in 1646 mentions a house, land, etc., valued at £9, and another old house with barn and eight acres of land valued at £8, 10s. and one cow and a heifer, estimated at £6, 10s. Thomas Firman was a leading citizen. His house was appraised in the inventory at £15, and the house he had bought of John Proctor, with three acres of land, was estimated to be worth £18, 10s. Proctor's house was near the lower falls on County street, and his land included the estate now owned by Mr. Warren Boynton, Mr. Samuel N. Baker and others. Few deeds of sale or inventories mention houses of any considerable value in these earlier years.

Richard Scofield sold a house and two acres of land to Robert Roberts, in 1643, for £11, 17s. In 1649 John West sold John Woodman, for £13, a house and an acre of land, and another half acre near the Meeting House. Robert Whitman sold John Woodman a house near the Meeting House, for £7. In 1652, Richard Scofield, leather dresser, sold Moses Pengry, yeoman, a house and land, for £17, and Solomon Martin sold Thomas Lovell, currier, a house and lot near the present "Dodge's Corner," for £16. Rarely in these opening years, the appraised value of an estate mounted to £100. In 1646, this was the valuation of John Shatswell's. It included a "house,

homestead, barn, cow house, orchard, yard, etc." Six oxen were appraised at £36, and five cows at £25, 0s. The average price received from the actual sale of houses was less than £25. Mr. John Whittingham had a house on High street containing kitchen and parlor, and chambers over the kitchen and parlor, sumptuously furnished, as the inventory records in 1648, and valued with the barn, cow house and forty-four acres of land, at £100.

The established value of a bullock seems to have been £6, and cows were appraised at about £5. A day's work of a team in drawing timber for the watch house, in 1645, was reckoned at 8 shillings, and in 1646, the inventory of the estate of Joseph Morse reveals the market prices of various commodities.

20 bushels of Indian corn were rated at	£2, 10s.
½ bushel of hemp seede, - - - -	2
6 small cheeses, - - - - -	2
20 lbs. butter, - - - - - -	10

These prices fix the purchasing power of money at that period and make it certain that houses, that were quoted at £25 and less, were very simple and primitive.

Often, we may presume, they were log-houses. Governor Winthrop records that Mr. Oldham had a small house near the wear at Watertown, made all of clapboards. In his diary, under date of 1646, he mentions a "dreadful tempest at N. E. with wind and rain, in which the lady Moodye her house at Salem, being but one story in height, and a flat roof with a brick chimney in the midst, had the roof taken off in two parts (with the top of the chimney) and carried six or seven rods off."

Thatch was the common roof covering, and the chimneys were built of wood, well covered, or "daubed," as the phrase was, with clay. Governor Winthrop mentions that Mr. Sharp's house in Boston took fire, in 1630 "(the splinters being not clayed at the top) and taking the thatch, burnt it down." Governor Dudley's account

of the fire speaks of this and Colborn's house "as good and well furnished as most in the plantation."

Better houses began to be built at an early period. Winthrop records a violent S. S. E. storm on March 16, 1638. "It overthrew some new strong houses, but the Lord miraculously preserved old weak cottages."

Thomas Lechford, in his Note Book, preserves an interesting contract, made by John Davys, joiner, to build a house for William Rix, in 1640; it was to be "16 foot long and 14 feet wide, with a chamber floare finish't, summer and joysts, a cellar floare with joysts finish't, the roofe and walls clapboarded on the out syde, the chimney framed without daubing, to be done with hewan timber." The price was to be £21.

Houses of this dimension were common, as late as 1665. In that year such inroads had been made upon the oaks and other valuable trees, that the Town of Ipswich ordered the Selectmen to issue a permit before a tree could be cut. The certificates issued possess a curious interest.

Edmund Bridges was allowed timber "to make up his cellar," in 1667. In 1670, Joseph Goodhue received permit for a house 18 feet square, and Ephraim Fellows for a house 16 feet square. In 1671, Thomas Burnam's new house was 20 feet square, that of Obadiah Bridges 18 feet square, and Deacon Goodhue built one 16 feet square. In 1657, Alexander Knight, a helpless pauper, was provided with a house at the Town's expense, and the vote provided that it should be 16 feet long, 12 feet wide, 7 or 8 feet stud, with thatched roof, for which £6 was appropriated.

People of quality erected comfortable houses, no doubt, at a very early period. In 1638, Deputy Governor Symonds purchased the Argilla farm now owned by the heirs of the late Thomas Brown, and straightway planned the house, which was erected at once on the site still to be traced, not far from the present farm house. Such interest attaches to the explicit directions he gave Mr.

Winthrop in a letter which remains to us, that I cannot forbear transcribing his exact words.

"I am indifferent whether it be 30 foote or 35 foote longe; 16 or 18 foote broade. I would have wood chimnyes at each end, the frames of the chimneys to be stronger than ordinary, to beare good heavy load of clay for security against fire. You may let the chimnyes be all the breadth of the howse if you thinke good; the 2 lower dores to be in the middle of the howse, one opposite to the other. Be sure that all the dore waies in every place be soe high that any man may goe vpright vnder. The staiers I think had best be placed close by the dore. It makes noe great matter though there be noe particion upon the first flore; if there be, make one biger then the other. For windowes let them not be over large in any rooms and as few as conveniently may be; let all have current shutting draw windows, haveing respect both to present & future vse. I think to make it a girt house will make it more chargeable then neede; however, the side bearers for the second story being to be loaden with corne, etc. must not be pinned on, but rather eyther lett in to the studds or borne vp with false studds and soe tenented in at the ends. I leave it to you and the carpenters. In this story over the first, I would have a particion, whether in the middest or over the particion under, I leave it.

In the garrett noe particion, but let there be one or two lucome [Lutheran?] windows, if two, both on one side. I desire to have the sparrs reach downe pretty deep at the eves to preserve the walls the better from the wether. I would have it sellered all over and soe the frame of the howse accordeingly from the bottom. I would have the howse stronge in timber, though plaine & well brased. I would have it covered with very good oake-hart inch board for the present, to be tacked on onely for the present, as you tould me. Let the frame begin from the bottom of the cellar & soe in the ordinary way vpright, for I can hereafter (to save the timber within grounde) run up a thin brick worke without. I think it best to have the walls without to be all clap boarded besides the clay walls."

This stoutly built two-storied house, with its enormous fireplaces, as wide as the rooms, and its projecting eaves, must have been both picturesque and comfortable, though the interior arrangement was very simple. We can hardly believe that houses of this size and style were common at this period, though Rev. Nathaniel Rogers's

manse, facing the South Green, had two full stories, and so had Mr. Whittingham's on High street. For the most part, these old Ipswich houses were small and rough in outward appearance, and the best and stateliest, innocent of paint, with small windows and diamond-shaped panes of glass, daubed with clay instead of plaster, were far removed from the most ancient style, with which we are familiar.

Here is a contract for the building of a pretty comfortable parsonage-house, in Beverly, "for the use of the ministrie on Cap An Side," as the record says, and the date of it is the 23: of March, 1656-1657.

The psents witnesseth a bargain maid betweene John norman of manchester the one partie: & Tho Lothrop & James patch the other ptyes for & in consideration of an house: that is to say. John norman is to build an house for them: which is to be thirtie eyght foote longe: 17: foote wide & a leuen foote studd, with three chimnies towe below & one in the chamber he is also to finde boards & clapboards for the finishing the same with a single couering with a porch of eight foote square & Jotted ouer one foote ech way to lap the floores booth below & a boue & one garret chamber: & to make doores and windows: foure below and foure aboue & one in the stodie the said John is to make the stoaires & to drawe the clapboards & shoot their edges: & also to smooth the boards of one of the chamber flowres & he is to bring up the frame to the barre or the ferry att his owne charge.

& the said John norman is to haue for his worke fourtie fiue pounds: to be paid in corne & cattell the one halfe att or before the house be raised & the other halve the next wheate haruist.

in witnesse heare of we haue sett down our hands.

witnesse

Tho: Lothropp.
John norman

STUDY OF INTERIORS

Within, these homes were for the most part very plain and simple. Governor Dudley's house in Cambridge was reputed to be over-elegant, so that Governor Winthrop wrote him: "He did not well to bestow such cost about wainscotting and adorning his house, in the beginning of a plantation, both in regard to the expense

and the example." But Dudley was able to reply, that "it was for the warmth of his house, and the charge was but little, being but clap-boards, nailed to the wall in the form of wainscott." The common finish of the rooms of houses of the better sort was a coating of clay, over the frame timbers and the bricks which filled the spaces between the studs. The ceilings were frequently, if not universally, left unfinished, and the rough, unpainted beams and floor joists, and the flooring of the room above, blackened with the smoke and grimy with dust, were a sombre contrast to the white ceilings of the modern home. The living room of the ancient house of the Whipples, probably the oldest in our town, was not lathed and plastered overhead until the boyhood of the present owner, yet the finely paneled wood-work of the side walls attests the excellence of the interior in its day. Paint and paper were unknown. Even whitewash was an invention of far later times.

Nevertheless, I incline to believe that if we could turn back the wheels of time and enter an early Ipswich home, we should find that it was not only habitable, but comfortable, and the furnishings much beyond our anticipation. For these yeomen and carpenters and weavers very likely had transported some of their furniture across the sea, and they reproduced here in the wilderness the living rooms of their old English homes.

Happily our curiosity may be gratified in very large degree by the numerous inventories that remain, and we may in imagination undertake a tour of calls in the old town, and see for ourselves what those houses contained. There were but two rooms on the main floor, the "hall" and the parlor, and entrance to them was made from the entry in the middle of the house. The "hall" of the old Puritan house, was the "kitchen" of a little later times. Indeed, these two words are used of the same apartment from the earliest record. It was the living room, the room where they cooked and ate and wrought and sat; in one home at least, that of Joseph Morse, a

well-to-do settler, the room where his bed was set up, wherein he died in 1646.

The chief object in this family room was ever the fireplace, with its broad and generous hearth and chimney, ample enough to allow boys bent on mischief to drop a live calf from the roof, as they did one night, into poor old Mark Quilter's kitchen. As brick chimneys were not the rule at first, safety could be secured only by building their wooden chimneys, daubed with clay, abnormally large. No wonder the worthy folk who wrote those inventories invariably began with the fireplace and its appurtenances. Piled high with logs, roaring and snapping, it sent forth most comfortable heat, and cast a warm glow over the plainest interior, and beautified the humblest home. "Here is good living for those that love good fires," Pastor Higginson wrote. Bare walls, rough, unfinished ceilings, floors without carpets or rugs, all took on an humble grace; privation and loneliness and homesickness could be forgotten, in the rich glow of the evening firelight.

Several pairs of andirons or cobirons were frequently used to support logs of different lengths. In one hall, at least, two pair of cobirons, and a third pair ornamented with brasses are mentioned. Within easy reach, were the bellows and tongs, the fire-pan for carrying hot coals, the "fire-fork" and "fire-iron," for use about the hearth, we presume.

Over the fire hung the trammel or coltrell, as it is called in one inventory, pot hooks, from the wooden or iron bar within the chimney that was supplanted by the crane in later times, and pots and kettles of copper, brass or iron, and of sizes, various. Some of these kettles must have been of prodigious size. Matthew Whipple had three brass pots that weighed sixty-eight pounds, and a copper that weighed forty pounds. The rich John Whittingham's kitchen, in his High street home, boasted a copper that was worth £3 10s, and Mr. Nelson of Rowley had "a great copper" that was in-

ventoried at £10 sterling. The family washing, soap-making, candle-dipping and daily cookery, no doubt, required them all.

A copper baking-pan, a great brass pan, spits for roasts, iron dripping pans to catch the juices, gridirons and frying-pans, an iron peele or shovel for the brick oven, a trivet (a three-legged support for hot pans or pots, or irons), and the indispensable warming-pan, were common appendages of this central orb.

Lesser articles — skimmers, skillets and ladles, chafing dishes and posnets, smoothing irons and box irons that were heated from within, and sieves covered with haircloth or tiffany, were found as well. Upon the open shelves stood the rows of pewter plates or platters, and latten or brass ware, all bright and shining in the fire light, and upon nails,

> "The porringers that in a row
> Hung high and made a glittering show."

Trenchers and trays and platters of wood were still common; "juggs" and leather bottles found place. Pewter salts, pots, bottles, spoons, cups and flagons, candlesticks of pewter or iron, spoons of silver or "alchimie," an alloy of brass, were common.

The dresser or cupboard or shelf bore the books that were found in almost every family: "the great Bible" and smaller Bibles, the Psalm book, some sad volumes of Doctor Preston's or Mr. Dike's or Doctor Bifield's theological writings, the "physike book" in one instance, and the silver bowl, or other cherished remnant of former luxury.

For furniture, there were tables and frames on which boards were laid and removed, forms or long settees, stools and cushions, but only a chair or two, for chairs were luxuries then.

Other clumsy things, that ought to have found place in barn or "leanto," are mentioned so regularly in the list of hall or kitchen chattels, that we are compelled to think they were really there — the "chirne," and pow-

dering tub, as they called the great tub used for salting meats, barrels and keelers, cowles for water-carrying and pails, bucking tubs for washing and buckets, beere vessels and sundry articles of unknown use, "earthen salts," "cheese-breads," "beekor balke," and "hayles."

Either those halls must have had extraordinary capacity for storage, or the occupants must have had scant room in many a house. Queer, confused rooms they must have been at best, in their furnishings and the multitude of employments continually going on, as suggested by the implements, the spinning and weaving, the sewing and knitting, the washing and ironing, cooking and brewing, butter and cheese-making. Their garnishings, too, were quaint. Strings of dried apples and corn, fat hams swinging in the smoke of the chimney and, grim and stern, the ever present fire-arms, ready for use at a moment's warning. The briefest inventory includes these.

Matthew Whipple's "hall," on the corner of Summer and County streets, must have been a veritable arsenal. Upon its walls hung three muskets, three pair bandoleers, three swords, and two rests, or crotched sticks, in which the long heavy musket barrel was rested while aim was taken, a fowling piece, a "costlett," or armor for the breast, a pike and sword, a rapier, a halberd and bill. In John Knowlton's "hall," we should have found a musket, bandoleers, rest, knapsack, moulds and scourer. John Lee, the owner of the land still known as Lee's, or Leigh's meadow, on the Argilla road, had a sword and belt, pistols and holster, and Luke Heard owned a "pistolett." Head pieces and corselets were not uncommon. John Winthrop's kitchen may have been a depot of supply, for it contained fourteen muskets, rests and bandoleers.

The frequent mention of candlesticks suggests that candles were in common use in these first Ipswich homes, yet a more primitive method was common in the poorer families at least.

Higginson tells us how the Salem houses were lighted, at the beginning of the settlement. "Although New England have no tallow to make candles of, yet by the abundance of the fish there of, it can afford oil for lamps. Yea, our pine trees that are the most plentiful of all wood, doth allow us plenty of candles, which are very useful in a house. And they are such candles as the Indians commonly use, having no other, and they are nothing else but the wood of the pine tree, cloven in two little slices, something thin, which are so full of the moysture of turpentine and pitch, that they burn as cleere as a torch. "Candlewood," is the name of a fine farm district of our town today. It assures us that the Ipswich planters knew the value of the fat pine strips. "Old lamps," are sometimes mentioned, perhaps the open iron or tin cup with a wick lying over one side fed with fish oil, or lamps brought with their household goods.

The frugality of the early living is frequently remarked on. Felt says, "For more than a century and a half, the most of them had pea and bean porridge, or broth, made of the liquor of boiled salt meat and pork, and mixed with meal, and sometimes hasty pudding and milk, both morning and evening. But those great spits (Matthew Whipple had four that weighed together twenty pounds), brass baking pans and dripping pans, kettles and pots, gridirons, frying pans and skillets, tell of more appetizing fare.

The cattle in the stalls and the abounding game in forest and sea, furnished the material for substantial and generous living for the great majority, we will believe. Yet the best-spread table would have looked strange to us. Wooden plates, sometimes a square bit of wood, slightly hollowed or perfectly plain, and platters for the central dish, at best dishes and plates of bright pewter; no forks, for forks did not attain common use till the latter years of the century; no coffee or tea, but plenty of home-brewed beer and cider and

stronger spirits for drinks,—these things seem rude in style and deficient in comfort.

In the parlor, or "the fine-room," surprises await us as well. Like the hall, it had its fireplace, and its goodly array of hearth furniture, but its furnishings were rarely elegant. The most conspicuous article, even in the homes of rich men, like Matthew Whipple and John Whittingham, was the best bed, of imposing size and stately elegance, with its curtains and valance, or half curtain, that hung from the cross pieces to the floor, and is still in use with ancient bedsteads, — fitted most luxuriously with a mat upon the cords, and with beds that awake our envy. Matthew Whipple's best feather bed, bolster and nine pillows weighed one hundred and six pounds, and were valued at £5–6–0. Mr. Whittingham's parlor bed and furnishings were worth £12–0–0, Thomas Barker's of Rowley, £13–0–0. What an amount of "solid comfort" is represented by an hundred weight of feathers with a warming pan, in those bleak Puritan winters!

The furnishings were ample. Mine host Lumpkin, one of the earliest inn-keepers, had 2 flock beds and 2 bolsters, in addition to the feather bed; also five blankets, one rug and one coverlet. Strangely enough, a rug or carpet was a bed furnishing and not a floor covering and mention remains of a rug for the baby's cradle.

In John Jackson's house, close by the present Methodist meeting-house, was "a half-headed bedstead," that rejoiced in "an old dornix coverlet," and it had "a side bed for a child." Lionel Chute, the schoolmaster, in his East street home, had an "old damakell coverlet." Thomas Firman had "damicle curtaynes and vallens." A trundle bed was common. Beside the bed were a table, a "joyned table," as it is called, made with turned legs, and "joyned stools," few chairs, but plenty of cushions, and a "cushen stoole" occasionally. Whittingham's parlor had eleven curtains, and its two windows were

adorned with curtains and curtain rods, one of the few instances mentioned of which I am at present aware.

In the parlor, too, were the chests, the common strong boxes in which they brought their goods and the more elaborate ones for storage of bedding and table linen. One chest in Whipple's parlor was furnished with a glass and there were three simpler ones. These chests were highly prized by their owners, and they were important pieces of furniture when the closet and modern bureaus and chiffoniers had not yet found place. Lionel Chute mentions in his will, "all things in my chest, and white deep box with the locke and key." We read of great boarded chests and John Knowlton's "chest with a drawer": also of trunks and boxes. Robert Mussey bequeathed his daughter Mary in 1642 his home, adjoining that of John Dane the elder, "in the West street in the town," also "my best Bible," "a great brass pan to be reserved for her until she comes of years," and "the broad box with all her mother's wearing linen."

The "cubbered" as it was spelled, was common, and it bore a "cubbered clothe" "laced" or "fringed."

In some of the finest houses there was a clock, valued at £1 in Matthew Whipple's, £2 in Thomas Nelson's of Rowley. In Whipple's parlor, too, there was "a staniell bearing cloth"; and a "baize bearing cloth." This was used, it has been affirmed, for wrapping babies, when carried to baptism, and Puritan babies invariably went to church on the first Sunday after birth. On January 22, 1694, Judge Sewall records — "A very extraordinary storm by reason of the falling and driving of the snow. Few women could get to meeting. A child named Alexander was baptized in the afternoon." I fancy that many wee new-born children were taken to the Elder's hospitable fireside, before and after the baptism in the icy cold meeting house, and those bearing cloths may have been a kind of public property, and often seen in the first house of worship, for Whipple died the year the old house was sold, 1646.

The family still for extracting the fragrant oil from rose leaves and the medicinal virtues from roots and herbs found place in the stately Whittingham parlor; and in Giles Badger's of Newbury there were "a glass bowl, beaker and jugg," the only suggestion of toilet convenience which I remember. A case of glass bottles now and then is mentioned.

But of pictures for the wall and carpets for the floor, and the ornaments now deemed essential for parlor adornings, there were few. The finest Puritan parlor of these early days was only a primitive best bed-room. Indeed, it was not always a spare room. Joseph Morse, whose will was probated in 1646, bequeathed his son John "the bed and all y^{e} bedding he lyeth on, standing in the parlor."

Above stairs the sleeping apartments of the family were found. For the most part, they were cold and cheerless, mere lofts, as the houses were of one story. In one house at least, in Rowley, the floor boards were laid so loosely that a person above could look down through the cracks and see whatever was occurring below, as a witness testified before the court. If such wide spacing was common the heat from the hall fire would have made the "chamber over the kitchen" the coveted room.

But Mr. Whittingham's house had a set of fire irons in the chamber over the parlor, and this excess of dignity betokens not only more of comfort than fell to the common lot, but a larger house, with two full stories, as the fittings of the room indicate as well, — an interesting item architecturally, since Mr. Whittingham died in 1648.

The contents of that chamber are so interesting that they deserve a full record as showing how much of luxury even was found in the better class of Ipswich houses of this early period.

"A bedstead, two fether beds, curtains, rugg, etc."	£13– 0–0
"One fether bed, one boulster, two quilts, two pair blankets, one coverlet, and trundlebed,"	6– 0–0
"Four trunks, one chest, one box, two chairs, four stools, two small trunks,"	3– 5–0
"9 pieces of plate, 11 spoons	25– 0–0
"10 pr. sheets, £8 ten others £4	12– 0–0
"3 prs. pillow beers 8s	1– 4–0
"3 " " " 5s	15–0
"Four table cloths	2–10–0
"1 doz. diaper, 2 doz. flaxen napkins	1–10–0
"2 doz. of napkins	12–0
"the hangings in the chamber,"	1–10–0
"3 holland cupboard cloths"	2– 4–0
2 half sheetes	1–10–0
1 diaper and damask cupboard cloth	1– 0–0
one screene	10–0
2 pair cob-irons, 1 pr. tongs	15–0
one carpett	3–10–0
"one pair curtains and vallance	5– 0–0
"one blew coverlet,"	1– 0–0

This was a regal room for the times, with its carpet and screen, its hangings upon the walls, its rich store of family silver, and its sumptuous beds and bed linen. Think of twenty pairs of sheets, all spun and woven by hand, and a single bedstead with its belongings, worth 13 pounds sterling, more than twice the whole value of some of the dwellings of that day! But Shakespeare's will specified the "second best bed" for his wife's portion — and extraordinary value commonly attached to these high posted, canopied, curtained structures. Yet this room had no looking glass nor toilet articles, nor bureau nor case of drawers.

In the other chamber we find a variety of miscellaneous articles besides the beds and bedding, a saddle, rolls of canvas of different value, 10 yds of French serge, 6 yds. of carpeting, remnants of holland and a valuable assortment of wearing apparel, worth £22, unfortunately for our information, with no mention of garments in detail.

In Matthew Whipple's chamber, there were 7 children's blankets, and a pillion cloth and foot stool. At Joseph Morse's, the chamber was a store room, where were deposited, as we have mentioned:

20 bushels Indian corn	£2– 10–0
mault	
half bushel hemp seede	2–0
6 small cheeses	2–0
20 pounds butter	10–0
"hemp drest and undrest."	10–0

One other fine interior must be noted — that of Nathaniel Rogers — pastor of the church from June, 1636, to 1655, whose residence stood very near the old Baker house, so called, fronting on the South Green, and whose house lot reached down to the River, and was bounded by Mr. Saltonstall's property on the S. W. and Isaac Coming's on the N. E.

Mr. Rogers died in 1655 leaving an estate, real and personal, valued at £1497, a princely fortune in those days. His hall contained a small cistern, with other implements, valued at 17s. (this was an urn, probably of pewter, for holding water and wine, and the "other implements" were wine-glasses perhaps), two Spanish platters, of earthen or china ware, very rare at that time, a chest and hanging cupboard, a round table with five joined stools, six chairs and five cushions. Evidently this was a dining room, for the kitchen was a separate room, with an elaborate set of pewter dishes, flagons and the like that weighed a hundred and fifty pounds, and the usual paraphernalia of cooking utensils including a "jacke" for turning the spit.

The parlor contained some rare articles, a great chair, two pictures, a livery cupboard, a clock and other implements worth three pounds, window curtains and rods, and the one solitary musical instrument in all the town, so far as early inventories show, "a treble violl," by which is meant, it may be supposed, a violin. Yet this elegant room had a canopy bed and down pillows.

The chamber furnishings were exceptionally fine. Its bed and bedding were valued at £14–10–0. A single "perpetuanny coverlet" was appraised at £1–05–0. There was a gilt looking glass, a "childing wicker basket" for the babies' toilet, perhaps, a table basket, and a sumptuous store of linen. A single suit of diaper table linen was reckoned at £4, two pair of holland sheets at £3–10s., five fine pillow-beeres or cases, £1–15s., and goods brought over from Old England worth over twenty pounds.

In the chamber over the hall were a yellow rug, a couch, silver plate worth £35–18s., and the only watch I have ever found mentioned, valued at £4, in addition to the common furniture.

The study gloried in a library worth £100–0–0, an extraordinary collection of books, revealing scholarly tastes as well as a plethoric purse, a cabinet, a desk and two chairs, and a pair of creepers or little fire irons.

In contrast with the comfort and luxury of these fine homes, "the short and simple annals of the poor" would be of deep interest. Unfortunately for us, as well as for the humble folk themselves, who dwelt in houses sixteen and eighteen feet square, their belongings were so few and cheap that an inventory seemed superfluous, and we are left largely to our own surmising as to how they lived. One glimpse into the humbler sort of home is permitted us in the inventory of William Averill. His will was entered in 1652. He gives to each of his seven children the sum of five shillings, "for my outward estate being but small." In his inventory his house and lot were appraised at £10, and the furnishings enumerated are:

1 iron pott, 1 brass pott, 1 frying pan, 4 pewter platters 1 flagon, 1 iron kettle, 1 brass kettle, 1 copper, 1 brass pan, and some other small things,	£2–17–0
2 chests, 1 fether bed, 1 other bed, 2 pair of sheets, 2 bolsters, 3 pillows, 2 blankets, 1 coverlid, 1 bedstead, and other small linen,	5–10–0
2 coats and wearing apparel	3– 0–0

a warming pan	3–0
a tub, 2 pails, a few books	10–0
a corslett	1– 0–0

The total of house, land, cattle and goods being £50.

He was not desperately poor then, but his circumstances were somewhat narrow. His family numbered nine souls, yet they had but one bedstead, and beds and bedding only adequate for this, and four pewter platters for the daily meals. How these nine Averills ate and slept would be an entertaining story, and a reproof to much discontent.

In Coffin's History of Newbury I find the following, under the date 1657: "Steven Dow did acknowledge to him it was a good while before he could eate his masters food viz. meate and milk, or drinke beer, saying he did not know it was good, because he was not used to eat such victuall, but to eate bread and water porridge, and to drink water." No doubt many a family of the poorer sort lived as frugally as he.

The house of John Winthrop, jun., who led the little band of settlers to our town in 1633, is the most interesting of the earliest homes. "An Inventorie of Mr. Winthropps goods of Ipswitch," made by William Clerk, about the year 1636, while Mr. Winthrop was in England, has recently come into the possession of the Historical Society. Thanks to the carefulness of the ancient recorder, we know the contents of every room, and we find far less of luxury than Mr. Rogers enjoyed. Indeed, the humblest of his fellow-citizens might have felt at home in the unpretentious domicile of the excellent young leader. The inventory was made at so early a date, moreover, that it gives us certain knowledge of the rooms and their furnishings of one of the original houses, it is safe to presume.

Imprs; In the Chamr ovr the Parlor 1 feathr bed 1 banckett 1 covrlett 1 blew rugg 1 boster & 2 pillowes.

trunck marked wih R. W. F. wherein is

1 mantle of silk wth gld lace

1 holland tablecloth some 3 yards loung

1 pr. SSS holl [twilled holland?] sheets
1 pillo bear half full of childs linning, etc.
5 childs blanketts whereof one is bare million
1 cushion for a child of chamlett
1 cours table cloth 3 yards long
6 cros cloths and 2 gnives?
9 childs bedds 2 duble clouts 1 pr holl sleeves
4 apons whereof 1 is laced
2 smocks 2 pr sheets 1 napkin
1 whit square chest wherein
1 doz. dyp. [diaper?] napkins 1 damsk napkin
1 doz. holl napkins
2 doz. & 2 napkins
2 cuberd cloths
11 pillow beares
11 SSS napkins
2 table cloths
4 towills
1 SSS holl shirt
2 dyp towills
3 dyp table cloths
1 pr SSS holl sheets
1 long great chest where in is
1 black gowne tam'y
1 gowne sea greene
1 childs baskett
2 old petticotts 1 red 1 sand collr serg
1 pr leathr stockins 1 muff
1 window cushion
5 quishion cases 1 small pillowe
1 peece stript linsy woolsy
1 pr boddyes
1 tapstry covrlett
1 peece lininge stuff for curtins
1 red bayes cloake for a woman
1 pr of sheets

In the Chamr ovr the kychin

1 feathr bed 1 boster 1 pillowe 2 blanketts
2 ruggs bl. & wt
2 floq bedds 5 ruggs 2 bolsters 1 pillowe
1 broken warming pan

In the Garrett Chamr ovr the Storehouse

many small things glasses, potts etc.

In the Parlor

1 bedsted 1 trundle bedsted wth curtains & vallences
1 table & 6 stooles
1 muskett, 1 small fowleing peece wth rest and bandeleer
♯ 1 trunk of pewter
♯ 1 cabbineet, wherin the servants say is
rungs [rings?] iewills 13 silr spoones this I cannot open
♯ 1 cabbinett of Surgerie

In the kyttchin

1 brass baking pan
5 milk pans
1 small pestle & morter
1 steele mill
14 muskets, rests & bandeleers
2 iron kettles 2 coppr 1 brasse kettle
1 iron pott
2 bl jacks
2 skillitts whereof one is brasse
4 porringors
1 spitt 1 gratr
1 pr racks 1 pr andirnes 1 old iron rack
1 iron pole 1 grediron 1 pr tongs
2 brass ladies 1 pr bellowes
2 stills wth bottums

In Mr Wards hands

1 silvr cupp 6 spoones 1 salt of silver

In the ware howse

2 great chests naled upp
1 chest 1 trunk wch I had ordr not to open
1 chest of tooles
♯ 6 cowes 6 steeres 2 heiffers
♯ dyvrs peeces of iron and steele

Mr. Winthrop's wife and infant daughter had died not long before, and a pathetic interest attaches to the contents of the chests. The trundle bed in the parlor would indicate that this had been the family sleeping room. Evidently there were but four rooms and the house we can easily imagine was small and unassuming.

HOW THEY DRESSED

A demure Puritan simplicity, we may think, characterized the dress of our forefathers. Life in the wilder-

ness may seem to harmonize only with coarse and cheap attire, for an age of homespun logically admitted of no finery. Such preconceptions are wide of the truth. Puritan principle required a protest against current fashion as against religious and social usages; but the elegance and expensiveness of both male and female dress in Old England had been so great that a goodly degree of reaction and repression could find place and yet leave no small remnant of goodly and gay attire. Not a few of those men and women of old Ipswich came from homes of luxury, — Dudley and Bradstreet from the castle home of the Earl of Lincoln; Saltonstall from contact with the nobility in his knightly father's house; Winthrop and Whittingham from fine family connections. Many fair English costumes found place in their chests and strong boxes that came over the seas, and the plain houses and plainer meeting-house were radiant, on Sabbath days and high days, with bright colors and fine fabrics.

The common dress of men was far more showy than the fashion of today. A loose fitting coat, called a doublet, reached a little below the hips. Beneath this, a long, full waistcoat was worn. Baggy trousers were met just below the knee by long stockings, which were held in place by garters, tied with a bow-knot at the side. About the neck, a "falling band" found place, a broad, white collar, that appears in all pictures of the time; and a hat with conical crown and broad brim completed the best attire. A great cloak or heavy long coat secured warmth in winter. Their garments were of various material and color. Unfortunately, wearing apparel is usually mentioned in the bulk in inventories; but occasional specifications afford us an idea of the best raiment.

Mention is made of "a large blew cote" and "a large white coat"; of a fine "purple cloth sute, doublett and hose" belonging to John Goffe or Goss of Newbury, who also had a short coat, a pair of lead-colored breeches, a green doublett, a cloth doublett, a leather doublett, also

leather and woolen stockings, two hats and a cloth cap. The men generally had their rough suits of leather and homespun for the farm work, and the delicate clothing for special occasions. So we find musk-colored broadcloth and damson-colored cloth, cloth grass-green, blue waistcoats and green waistcoats, cloth hose, and hose of leather and woolen stuff, boots and shoes, black hats, home-made caps, gloves, silver buttons, of which John Cross owned three dozen and one, and sometimes a gown.

Of the ladies' wardrobe, I am loth to speak. Certain popular pictures of Priscilla at her spinning, and sweet Puritan maidens watching the departure of the Mayflower, have pleased our fancy, and forthwith we clothe the women of the days of old in quaker-like caps and dresses, graceful in their simplicity, — nun-like garbs, over which Dame Fashion had no tyranny. But the truth must be told.

Widow Jane Kenning, who lived near the corner of Loney's Lane, had for her best array, "a clothe gowne," worth £2 5s., "a serge gown" valued at £2, "a red petticoat with two laces," appraised at a pound sterling, and lesser ones of serge and paragon, a cloth waistcoat and a linsey woolsey apron. That "cloth waistcoat" was no mean affair, I judge. The lawyer, Thomas Lechford of Boston, who indulged in a silver-laced coat and a gold-wrought cap for himself, records: "Received of Mr. Geo. Story, four yards and half a quarter of tuft holland to make my wife a wastcoate at 2s. 8d. a yard." Widow Kenning's was worth 8s. Lechford also enters under date 1640, Feb. 1: "I pay'd John Hurd [a tailor in Boston], delivered to his wife by Sara our mayd, for making my wife's gown, 8s." "Tailor made" dresses are not a modern invention, then, and if Boston dames were patrons of tailors, the ladies of aristocratic Ipswich were not a whit behind.

For common wear, blue linen, lockram or coarse linen,

linsey-woolsey, mohair, a mixture of linen and wool, and holland were the common materials.

Dame Eliz. Lowle of Newbury had her riding suit and muff, silver bodkins and gold rings. Some interesting letters of Madame Rebeckah Symonds, a widow of the Deputy Governor, from her son by a former marriage in London, in the Antiquarian papers, reveal these wardrobe secrets. He wrote in 1664 of sending his mother a "flower satin mantle lined with sarsnet, £1 10s., a silver clasp for it 2s. 6d., cinnamon taffity 15s., two Cambrick whisks with two pare of cuffs £1" also, in the same ship, "a light blew blanket, 200 pins, 1½ yards chamlet, also Dod on the Commandments (bound in green plush), also a pair of wedding gloves, and my grandmother's funeral ring." In 1673, he sent "one ell ½ of fine bag Holland, 2 yds. ⅛ of lute-string, a Lawn whiske, wool cards one paire, a Heath Brush, 2 Ivorie Combe, ye bord box rest."

In her sixtieth year Madam Symonds, keenly alive to the demands of fashion, had written her son for a fashionable Lawn whiske; but he, anxious to gratify her, yet desirous as well that his mother should be dressed in strict accord with London fashion, replied that the "fashionable Lawn whiske is not now worn, either by Gentil or simple, young or old. Instead whereof I have bought a shape and ruffles, which is now the ware of the gravest as well as the young ones. Such as goe not with naked necks ware a black wifle over it. Therefore I have not only Bought a plaine one yt you sent for, but also a Lustre one, such as are most in Fashion."

She had sent for damson-colored Spanish leather for women's shoes. This, he informed her was wholly out of style and use, and "as to the feathered fan, I should also have found in my heart, to have let it alone, because none but very grave persons (and of them very few) use it. That now 'tis grown almost as obsolete as Russets, and more rare to be seen than a yellow hood."

Nevertheless, to please the exacting leader of the

Ipswich town, he sent, with ten yards of silk, and two yards of Lustre "a feather fan and silver handle, two tortois fans, 200 needles, 5 yds. sky calico, silver gimp, black sarindin cloak, damson leather skin, two women's Ivorie knives, etc."

Madame Symonds was no more addicted to the uttermost extreme of fashion than were the women of the first years of the settlement and the men themselves, we must confess. It is one of the anomalies of history that the most religious of all people, as we have come to think them, the Sabbath-keeping, church-going Puritans, should have been so far in thraldom to the world, the flesh and the devil, that they were guilty of frivolous excess in aping the fashions of the mother-land. But so it was.

In 1634, the love of fine clothes was so notorious, that the General Court felt constrained to lament "the greate sup fluous, and unnecessary expences occaconed by reason of some newe and imodest fashions, as also the ordinary wearing of silver, golde and silk laces, girdles, hatbands, etc." and ordered forthwith that no person either man or woman, "shall hereafter make or buy an *appell* either woolen, silke or lynnen, with any lace in it, silver, golde, silke or threade," under penalty of forfeiture of such clothes — "also noe pson, either man or woman, shall make or buy any slashed cloathes, other than one slash in each sleeve and another in the backes; also all cut-works, imbroidered or needle worke, cappes, bands and rayles, are forbidden hereafter to be made or worn, under the aforesaid penalty." Apparel already in use might be worn out, but the immoderate great sleeves, slashed apparel, immoderate great "rayles," long wings, etc., were to be curtailed and remodelled more modestly at once.

In 1639, when our town had been gathering strength five years, the fiat again went forth against "women's sleeves more than half an ell wide in the widest place, immoderate great breches, knots of ryban, broad shoul-

der bands, and rayles, silk roses, double ruffes and cuffes, etc." Sleeves were a target for Shakespeare's wit.

> "What, this a sleeve?
> There's snip, and nip, and cut and slish and slash,
> Like to a censor in a barber's shop."

No doubt the women of Ipswich needed admonition in these particulars, and some of the men most likely walked abroad with their doublet sleeves slashed to display the fine linen shirt sleeves beneath, with too large trousers and knots of ribbon in their shoes, or wearing boots with flaring tops, nearly as large as the brim of a hat, very conspicuous, if made of "white russet" leather, as Edward Skinner's in 1641. Perchance they dared to wear their hair below the ears, and falling upon the neck. The English Roundhead with short, cropped hair, in obedience to Paul's injunction, was the ideal of the sterner Puritans of our Colony, but there was from the beginning a persistent determination by some of the more frivolous sort, to wear long hair. Higginson jocosely discovered the origin of the fashion in the long lock worn by Indian braves. The General Court set its face as a flint against this in 1634. It was a burning theme of pulpit address, and the clergy prescribed that the hair should by no means lie over the band or doublet collar, but might grow a little below the ear in winter for warmth.

Nath. Ward, in his Simple Cobbler, dispensed wisdom: "If it be thought no wisdome in men to distinguish themselves in the field by the Scissers, let it be thought no injustice in God not to distinguish them by the sword," and "I am sure men use not to wear such manes." It was derisively suggested that long nails like Nebuchadnezzar's would be next in Fashion.

Rev. Ezekiel Rogers of Rowley was so bitter in his detestation of the habit that he cut off his nephew from his inheritance because of his persistence; and in his Election sermon before the General Court, he assailed long hair with fiery zeal.

So enormous was the offence that on May 10, 1649, Governor Endicott, Deputy Governor Dudley and seven of the Assistants thus declared themselves: "Forasmuch as the wearing of long hair after the manner of ruffians and barbarous Indians has begun to invade New England, contrary to the rule of God's word, which says, it is a shame for a man to wear long hair, etc., We, the magistrates, who have subscribed this paper, (for the shewing of our own innocency in this behalf) do declare and manifest our dislike and detestation against the wearing of such long hair, as against a thing uncivil and unmanly, whereby men doe deforme themselves, and offend sober and modest men, and doe corrupt good manners. We doe, therefore, earnestly entreat all the elders of this jurisdiction (as often as they shall see cause to manifest their zeal against it in their public administration) to take care that the members of their respective churches be not defiled therewith; that so such as shall prove obstinate and will not reforme themselves, may have God and man to witness against them."

Some gay-plumed ladies of his Ipswich church may have been in his mind, when grim Mr. Ward discharged himself of his ill-humor against the sex, affirming "When I heare a nugiperous Gentle-dame inquire what dress the Queen is in this week, what the nudius tertain of the Court, I look at her as the very gizzard of a trifle, the product of a quarter of a cypher, the Epitome of nothing, fitter to be kickt, if she were of a kickable substance, than either honored or humored."

"To speak moderately, I truly confess it is beyond the ken of my understanding to conceive, how those women should have any true grace or valuable vertue, that have so little wit as to disfigure themselves with such exotick garbs, as not only dismantles their native lovely lustre, but transclouts them into gant bar-geese, ill-shapen, shotten shell-fish, Egyptian hieroglyphics, or at the best into French flurts of the pastry, which a proper English woman should scorn with her heels. It is no marvel

they wear drailes on the hinder part of their heads, having nothing as it seems in the fore-part but a few Squirrel brains to help them frisk from one ill-favor'd fortune to another."

His indignation against tailors for lending their art to clothe women in French fashions was intense: "It is a more common than convenient saying that nine Taylors make a man; it were well if nineteene could make a woman to her minde; if Taylors were men indeed, well furnished but with meer morall principles, they would disdain to be led about like apes. by such mimick Marmosets. It is a most unworthy thing for men that have bones in them to spend their lives in making fidlecases for futilous women's phansies; which are the very pettitoes of infermity, the gyblets of perquisquilian toyes."

Ridicule, precept and statute law were alike powerless to check this over-elegance. Again in 1651, the General Court repeated its "greife . . . that intollerable excesse and bravery hath crept in upon us, and especially amongst people of meane condition, to the dishonor of God, the scandall of its professors, the consumption of estates, and altogether unsuteable to our povertie." Hence it proceeded to declare its "utter detestation and dislike that men or women of mean condition, educations and callings should take upon them the garb of gentlemen by the wearing of gold and silver lace, or buttons, or poynts at their knees, to walke in greate bootes, or women of the same ranke to wear silke or tiffany hoodes or scarfes, which though allowable to persons of greater estate or more liberal education, yet we cannot but judge intollerable in person of such like condition."

So, at last, it was ordered that no person whose visible estate did not exceed £200 should wear such buttons or gold or silver lace, or any bone lace above 2s. per yard or silk hoods or scarfs, upon penalty of 10s. for each offence. Magistrates and their families, military officers,

soldiers in time of service, or any whose education or employments were above the ordinary were excepted from the operation of this law.

The judicial powers were in grim earnest, and at the March term of the Quarter Sessions Court, in Ipswich, some of her gentle folk felt the power of the law.

Ruth Haffield, daughter of the widow whose farm was near the bridge, still called "Haffield's," was "presented" as the legal phrase is, for excess in apparel, but upon the affidavit of Richard Coy, that her mother was worth £200 she was discharged. George Palmer was fined 10s. and fees for wearing silver lace. Samuel Brocklebank, taxed with the same offence, was discharged. The wife of John Hutchings was called to account shortly after for wearing a silk hood, but she proved that she had been brought up above the ordinary rank and was discharged. John Whipple made it evident that he was worth the requisite £200 and his good wife escaped. Anthony Potter, Richard Brabrook, Thomas Harris, Thomas Maybe and Edward Brown were all called upon to justify their wives' finery.

In 1659 the daughter of Humphrey Griffin presumed to indulge in a silk scarf, and her father was fined 10s. and court fees. John Kimball was able to prove his pecuniary ability and his wife wore her silk scarf henceforth unquestioned. As late as 1675, Arthur Abbott, who is mentioned as the bearer of fine dress goods from Madame Symonds' son in London, and who very naturally may have brought his good wife some finery from the London stores, was obliged to pay his 10s. for his wife's public wearing of a silk hood. Benedict Pulcipher for his wife, Haniell Bosworth for his two daughters, John Kindrick, Thomas Knowlton and Obadiah Bridges for their wives' over dress, were called to account before judge and jury.

The middle of the century found one of the most whimsical and extraordinary fashions in vogue in England, and New England was infected as well, we presume.

Ladies decorated their faces with court-plaster, cut in fantastic shapes. Bulwer, in his "Artificial Changeling," published in 1650, in England, speaking of these patches says "some fill their visage full of them," and he describes the shapes one fine lady delighted to wear: "a coach with a coachman and two horses with postilions on her forehead, a crescent under each eye, a star on one side of her mouth, a plain circular patch on her chin."

In "Wit Restored," a poem printed in 1658:

> "Her patches are of every cut
> For pimples and for scars;
> Here's all the wandering planets' signs
> And some of the fixed stars,
> Already gummed to make them stick.
> They need no other sky."

As the century waned, the offence of wearing long hair paled into insignificance beside the unspeakable sin of wearing wigs. Happily, or unhappily, as the point of view varies, the ministers could not agree in this. The portrait of Rev. John Wilson, of Boston, who died in 1667, presents him wearing a full wig, and many of the clergy were addicted to the same head-gear; but public sentiment was strong against the fashion, and the General Court in 1675, condemned "the practise of men's wearing their own or other's hair made into periwigs." Judge Sewall alludes to the hated custom with spiteful brevity in his Diary.

> "1685—Sept. 15. Three admitted to the church. Two wore periwigs."
>
> 1697—Mr. Noyes of Salem wrote a treatise on periwigs.
>
> 1708—Aug. 20. Mr. Cheever died. The welfare of the province was much upon his heart. He abominated periwigs."

The Judge felt such extreme virulence toward these "Horrid Bushes of Vanity," that he would not sit under the ministrations of his own pastor, who had cut off his hair and donned a wig, but worshipped elsewhere.

In our neighbor town of Newbury, the clerical wig was so much an affront that, in 1752, Richard Bartlett was taken to task for refusing to commune with the

church because the pastor wore a wig, and because the church justified him in it, and also for that "he sticks not from time to time to assert with the greatest assurance that all who wear wigs, unless they repent of that particular sin before they die, will certainly be dammed, which we judge to be a piece of uncharitable and sinful rashness."

But the battle was already lost. In 1722, here in Ipswich, just about on the site of the Seminary building, Patrick Farrin, chirurgeon, boldly hung out his sign, "periwig-maker" and the gentlemen of Ipswich could have their wigs and keep them curled, powdered and frizzled as fashion required.

Women, too, were given to marvelous coiffures. Cotton Mather apostrophized the erring sex in 1683 — "Will not the haughty daughters of Zion refrain their pride in apparel? Will they lay out their hair, and wear their false locks, their borders and towers like comets about their heads?" They were called "apes of Fancy, frizling and curlying of their hayr." They had fallen far away from the Puritan "bangs" to which Higginson alludes in his comment on the Indians. "Their hair is generally black and cut before like our gentlewomen." Then, their hair was built aloft and extended out "like butterfly wings over the ears." "False locks were set on wyers to make them stand at a distance from the head."

A bill is mentioned by Felt, as contracted in this town in 1697 "for wire and catgut in making up attire for the head."

But legal restriction of dress was at an end. The whim of the wearer, and the state of the purse, henceforth determined the fashion of head dress and raiment.

SOME OLD IPSWICH HOUSES

By Thomas Franklin Waters

It is a partial recompense for the sleepy, unprogressive life that has prevailed in old Ipswich for a century or more that a large number of substantial mansions of the colonial type have been preserved in their pristine simplicity. They have escaped the smart remodelling incident to vigorous prosperity, which often despoils such of their old chimneys, and improves them, as the phrase is, with porticoes, piazzas, bay-windows and modern coverings for the roof, until only a memory of the original house remains. Nearly every one of our ancient mansions retains its severe Puritan plainness of architecture, the great chimney stack, jutting-over stories, small windows and modest front door. The only change they have suffered is the ancient one which was in vogue more than two centuries ago, when new rooms were built on the back side, and new rafters were run towards the ridge-pole, giving the familiar "lean-to" roof.

Many of these houses are of venerable age, beyond a doubt, but not so old by many years, I am convinced, as popular belief assigns them. It pleases our local pride to call them relics of the earliest times. It gratifies their owners or occupants to see them gazed at with wide-eyed wonder by the stranger to whom the story of their great age is told. The visiting artist or lover of antiquarian lore is enraptured with their appearance and the traditions that cluster about them, and straightway publishes abroad the quaint charm of these old landmarks. When our 250th anniversary was celebrated, certain old dwellings were placarded to the effect that they were built in 1635, or thereabouts. Statements of this nature are still being made at frequent intervals.

In the interest of historic truth alone, I am compelled to call attention to the facility with which error can be

made in this field, the importance of recognizing certain cardinal principles of accurate historical research, and the pressing need of an unbiased application of these principles to the antiquities of our town, before the errors already made are hopelessly crystallized.

A strong presumption against the veracity of any reputed date, before the middle of the seventeenth century at the least, is found in the known facts relating to the architecture of our earliest times.

The builders of this town found it in a wilderness, hardly broken by the few squatter settlers who had dwelt here prior to their coming. They built as any pioneer builds today, I imagine — as the Plymouth Pilgrims did — simple homes of logs, or hand-hewed timber, with thatch-roof and wooden chimney, well covered with clay to save it from burning. They had no time for elaborate house-building, for land had to be cleared, crops sown and tended, and provision made for their support through the coming winter. They had no material for nice carpentry. Permission to build the first saw-mill, of which any record remains, was not granted until 1649. Every joist and board was sawed by hand in saw pits, or smoothed with the broad-axe. Every nail, hinge and lock was hammered out by the blacksmith.

Adequate evidence of reputed age must of necessity be documentary.

Tradition is whimsical and fantastic. It chains poor Harry Main on Ipswich bar, and locates a ghost in his house, recently demolished, which was vanquished by the united efforts of the three ministers then resident here, and effectually cast out. It frightens old Nick out of the meeting house when Whitefield preaches and shows his footprint in the ledge.

Tradition is ludicrously unhistoric. It links the romance of the regicides with a house, that was not built until long years after the last of the famous three had been buried in the secret grave. Tradition is no more reliable than the common gossip of the town. It has

a grain of truth today. Tomorrow it will be wholly false. A month hence, its falsehood will be curious and wondrous.

A sober and reliable man recently affirmed that, in his boyhood, the farm house recently purchased by Mr. Campbell of Mr. Asa Wade was moved from a neighboring corner to its present location; but Mrs. Julia Willett, who was married in the old house that stood about where the present one is, and went to live at Willett's mill near by, states that the present house was built, where it stands, about 1833, and Mr. Francis H. Wade is confident that the house which was moved is the one now owned and occupied by Mrs. William Kimball. How easily the history of these houses is confused and misstated only sixty years away from the fact!

An ancient type of architecture is an insufficient proof of extreme age. One of our most venerable houses was torn down when Mr. George E. Farley's house was built, and its site is occupied by his residence. The old relic had all the marks of great age: huge chimney, projecting over-stories, low, sloping "lean-to" roof, great summers or central beams in the low studded lower rooms, and very small windows.

This corner was purchased by William Donnton of Thomas Lovell in 1695, an unpretending hundred-rod lot with no building of any sort mentioned as standing upon it. These old deeds are very explicit and that so large an item as a house could have been omitted in the description of the estate is incredible. At Donnton's decease his daughter Elizabeth, wife of Robert Perkins, sold her right and title in "the mansion or dwelling house and barn, with part of the homestead on which they stand to our loving brother-in-law, Joseph Holland," in 1721. In 1765, at Widow Holland's death, it was purchased by Francis Holmes, a physician. This old mansion was built, therefore, subsequently to 1695.

This type of architecture, it is believed, established itself about 1660, but it continued well into the following century.

Contemporaneous documentary evidence, then, deeds of sale, wills, town records, etc., must be the decisive test, and when the credible written document conflicts with the unwritten tradition or the recorded tradition even, the tradition must go to the wall. Even this evidence must be carefully weighed, for there is possibility of error lurking here.

The question of the identity of a house now in existence with a house mentioned in an early deed or record is always pertinent. As in our own time, a man may buy an estate, remove the old house, build anew, and sell again, and no evidence of this appear in the deeds, except from an enhanced price; so a succession of houses may have occupied the same lot in the past, without a word of allusion in the deeds to any change. It is an historic fact that houses had been built very near the beginning of our town on many lots, which may be readily recognized, and on some of which old houses still remain; but it is far from certain that these are the identical early dwellings.

The use of material from an old house is construction of a new one may also prove a false scent. An old brick with a date stamped upon it may be found; but this may have been used as a souvenir of some earlier building. Unsupported by more substantial evidence it cannot carry much weight.

An interesting illustration of the blending of the old and the new has just been afforded by the building of an addition to the house owned by the late William Kinsman on the South side. On stripping off the modern clap-boards it was seen that the boarding was very old. One board of clear white pine, extra thick, was twenty-three inches wide. Many hand-wrought nails were found. As cut nails were not made until 1790, it might have been surmised that this was the identical old house that

deeds of sale mention far back into the preceding century. But it is known that this old building was either destroyed, or changed so completely that a new house resulted about the beginning of this century, and careful inspection shows old nail holes that indicate an earlier use of these old boards.

The question of age then, it will be seen, is one that admits of no certain solution in many instances. Identity may not be disproved, but it is not established for lack of proof to the contrary. The principles we have already outlined, as underlying all historic judgment, compel us to admit the existence of doubt as to the validity of the supposed date, where great antiquity is assumed.

It will be recognized readily now, that the accurate determination or even approximation of age of any building involves much careful research. Step by step, advance must be made toward the goal. No guesswork, no hasty assumption, no romantic fancies can be tolerated. The toil involved is great, but it is as fascinating as the prying open of any secret in nature or in history. In my own researches I have arrived at certain conclusions which I proceed to state, as an illustration of the method which seems to me necessary, in every case, before probable accuracy can be assumed.

JOHN WHIPPLE'S HOUSE

The old house now owned by Mr. James W. Bond, near the depot, shall be the first considered. In the original division of lands, according to the town records, Daniel Denison received two acres near the mill, Mr. Fawn's house-lot being southwest, and Mr. Fawn's lot was bounded by Mr. Samuel Appleton's on the southwest. The Denison land included the area bounded by Market, Winter and Union streets at present. The Appleton ownership of land beyond the old house is unquestioned. Mr. Fawn's house-lot included the site of the old mansion.

As early as 1638, allusion is made in the town records to the house-lot "formerly John Fawn's." Felt says that he removed to Haverhill in 1641. He may have gone earlier. In the year 1642, John Whipple was in occupation of this property, for in that year the town ordered that John Whipple "should cause the fence to be made between the house late Captain Denison's and the sayd John Whipple, namely on the side next Capt. Denison's." Denison had sold his house and land here to Humphrey Griffin on Jan. 19, 1641, the record informs us, so that the allusion to a change of ownership occasions no difficulty.

Mr. John Fawn executed a quitclaim deed in October, 1650, which confirmed the sale of a house and 2½ acres of land to Mr. John Whipple, formerly sold unto said John Whipple by John Jolley, Samuel Appleton, John Cogswell, Robert Muzzey and Humphrey Bradstreet. The nature of this earlier transaction is a mystery, but Fawn's title was not wholly extinguished until this deed was executed.

The will of John Whipple, senior, signed and sealed May 19, 1669, gave his house, etc., to his son John. Capt. John Whipple's will dated Aug. 2, 1683, left his property to his sons, John, Matthew and Joseph, and his daughter. Joseph, not yet of age, was to have the house where he lived, if the other sons agreed. In the actual division "the mansion house, his father died in, with the barn, out-houses, kiln, orchard, etc., with 2½ acres of land more or less," was given to John.

The Whipple malt kiln is frequently mentioned from very early times. The building mentioned in this will is probably the same that stood where the mill storehouse is now, which was removed about sixty-five years ago to the lot adjoining the South parsonage, built up a story, and still serves the better purpose of shop and woodshed, its boards and timbers blackened by years of malting.

Major John Whipple in his will, 1722, gave his daugh-

ter, Mary Crocker and her heirs, his homestead and many of the furnishings; and a remembrance to his son-in-law, Benjamin Crocker. Mr. Crocker was a teacher of the grammar school and preached frequently. Major Joseph Hodgkins married a daughter of Benjamin Crocker, and bought out the others, I am informed. At his decease, Mr. Nathaniel Wade, a son-in-law, was administrator and sold the house and an acre of land to one Moore or More, who in his turn sold to Mr. Abraham Bond. Another acre was sold to Mr. Estes.

The pedigree of this property seems beyond a doubt. Mr. Saltonstall never owned a foot of land here. His ownership of the mill in the near vicinity is beyond question. He also owned the "Mill Garden," as it is called in the old records, but the location of this latter property is settled beyond question by the deed of sale, by Richard and Nathaniel Saltonstall to John Waite and Samuel Dutch (April 2, 1729), of one-third of the "Mill Garden," comprising one and one-half acres, bounded on the south-east by the Town River, on the north-east and north-west by the County Road, and on the south-west by the road leading to the mills, with house, dye-house, stable, mills, etc., lately the property of Col. Nathaniel Saltonstall of Haverhill.

Dutch disposed of his interest in the two grist mills and the piece of land called the Mill Garden near the mills, to John Waite, Jr., on Feb. 19, 1730. This "Garden" included, therefore, all the land bordering on the River from the Choate Bridge, down Market street, to the corner of Union, and then up Union street to the Mill. The house mentioned in the former deed was not Mr. Saltonstall's residence. His town dwelling and a goodly fourteen-acre home-lot were on the South side, and his deed of sale to Samuel Bishop (Sept., 1680), with other deeds, which will be mentioned in the study of "a group of old houses near the South Green," shows that his mansion was near the southern end of the Green.

Pleasing as it is to the popular mind to associate the

name of the high-born Saltonstall with this old mansion, if we value truth, as I interpret it, we must drop the old fable. As to the present house, it cannot reasonably be identified with the house of 1640 or thereabout, on the general grounds we have mentioned. The first John Whipple left an humble estate, the second John was very wealthy. His estate inventoried £3314. His household effects were elaborate and multitudinous. The probabilities are that he built the present mansion some time subsequent to 1669 and prior to 1683.

THE APPLETON HOUSE

The comfortable residence of Mr. George D. Wildes, on the corner of Market and Central streets, is much more ancient than its appearance indicates, and is one of the most interesting of our old mansions.

Happily, it has been owned by a succession of well-to-do people, who have kept it in excellent repair. The original shape of the house has been lost, however, as it was formerly three stories high, and several modern additions have been made. Mr. Hammatt surmised that it was built about 1681. This cannot be true. Col. John Appleton bought the lot, containing about an acre and a half, of Jacob Davis, for £33, February 25, 1707. There was no house on the land at that time. An old map of this locality shows that it was there in 1717. Between these two dates, probably about 1707, the house was built.

Colonel Appleton was Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas for many years, and Judge of Probate for thirty-seven years. He was also a Deputy and Councillor. In his day, the old mansion was one of the finest in our town, and was renowned for its elegance and open hospitality. Governor Shute on his way to New Hampshire tarried here in 1716, and many a distinguished traveller enjoyed its good cheer.

Col. John's son, Daniel, succeeded to the ownership on his father's death. He was also a Colonel, a Repre-

sentative, a Justice of the Court of Sessions, and Register of Probate from January 9, 1723, to Aug. 26, 1762.

Another Register of the old Probate Court, Daniel Noyes, who filled the office from Sept. 29, 1776, to May 29, 1815, owned and occupied this house, already so closely associated with the judicial annals of our town. He was a citizen of the finest quality. He was graduated from Harvard in 1758, taught the Grammar school from 1762 to 1774; was delegate to the Congress of the United Colonies in 1774-5, and became Postmaster in 1775.

Mr. Abraham Hammatt, the eminent antiquarian, purchased and remodelled the house, and from him it has come by inheritance to its present owner.

Before it was remodelled, it contained a dark chamber or closet, which came to have no small celebrity as the reputed hiding place of one of the Regicides. No record or tradition remains of any sojourn of a Regicide in this vicinity, and the house was not built for years after the last of the eminent fugitives had been laid to rest in his secret grave.

Nevertheless, the romantic tale found ready credence, and still survives. The late Mrs. Wilhelmina Wildes used to declare that it was the invention of some airy seminary girl, who roomed in the old house. Be that as it may, the dark room in question was very likely the repository of the probate records. It is well known that "Squire" Lord, who succeeded Mr. Noyes as Register, kept the books in his house until the brick probate office was built, and it is more than probable that Mr. Noyes and his predecessor, Colonel Appleton, provided a place of deposit under their own roof.

"YE SPARKS 'ORDINARY'"

Close by the Wildes mansion the Baker house, so called, now occupied by Mr. George K. Dodge, affords an interesting study. Is it identical with the famous

old hostelry kept by John Sparks, at which Judge Sewall used to lodge, and many another famous man?

This location was originally granted to William Fuller, the gunsmith of the Pequod expedition. To the half acre the town granted him, he added half an acre more, which he purchased of William Simmons, and another small lot which was bought of Christopher Osgood, who then adjoined him on the lower side, making about an acre and a quarter in all. He sold this with the "small dwelling" he had built to John Knowlton, shoemaker, in 1639. William White succeeded in the ownership, and sold "the dwelling house, barn, orchard, garden and Parrocke or inclosure of earable land adjoining," two acres in all, to "John Sparks, Biskett Baker," in 1671. In that year he received his first license "to sell beere at a penny a quart, provided he entertain no Town inhabitants in the night, nor suffer any to bring wine or liquors to be drunk in his house." He built a bake house for the furtherance of his business. For twenty years he kept his ordinary, and then sold an acre and a half of his property with the bake house and barn to Col. John Wainwright, but continued to live on the remainder. In 1705, John Roper sold the Colonel the house, "formerly in possession of Mr. John Sparks, now in possession of Mary, widow of John, with a small parcel of land."

When Colonel Wainwright sold the whole estate to Deacon Nath. Knowlton in 1707, it included two distinct tenements, as they were styled: the one higher up the Hill, occupied by Thomas Smith, innholder (which was probably the old tavern); the other, at the southeast corner, occupied still by the widow Sparks, who had a life interest in it. Deacon Knowlton divided the estate into three parts and sold them in 1710. Ebenezer Smith bought the lot on the southeast corner of the estate, with six rods frontage, and a small dwelling house. It is specified that it adjoined the Appleton property, now the Wildes estate. This then is easily identified as the

location now occupied by Mr. Charles W. Brown, the apothecary.

The middle lot, containing an acre of land with house, barn, etc., was sold to John Smith, shoemaker. The upper lot, measuring three rods on the street, without a house, was bought by Ephraim Smith, brother of John.

John Smith sold a part of his lot to Edward Eveleth in 1732, and all the rest of his estate, with the house, to Jacob Boardman in 1734. Boardman sold to Patrick Farren, a periwig-maker, and to James McCreelis of the same craft in 1735. McCreelis bought the other half and sold the whole to Nath. Treadwell, innkeeper, in 1737. Jacob Treadwell, son of Nathaniel, received "the tavern house" and land as his portion of the paternal estate in 1777. The Treadwell tavern was frequented by John Adams and the Bench and Bar of pre-revolutionary days, and figures in the diaries of the time. Moses Treadwell, jr., came into possession in 1815 and in 1834 his executors sold to Joseph Baker, Esq., of Boston, whose name still attaches to the house.

Evidently the house that the widow Sparks occupied stood about where Mr. C. W. Brown's house is today, as we have mentioned above. Was this the inn, or was the building, called the "bake-house," really the ordinary? The house is called a small house. Thomas Smith, the purchaser of the bake-house, etc., was the inn-keeper. I surmise that the latter alternative is the more probable. Is the present Baker house identical with that old "bake-house?" Its whole appearance indicates later architecture and more noble use. The probabilities all seem to me against such identification. But I know of no data which can establish its exact age. It was built evidently for two families. The two large chimneys seem to have been built in their present location, and not to replace an original central chimney stack. The arrangement of stairways, etc., indicates this double use. The house that Jacob Boardman sold to Patrick Farren and James McCreelis in 1735 was a double house

and probably this. Boardman bought the place in 1734 and it is wholly improbable that he would have built a new house and sold it at once. So it belonged to John Smith, we may presume, and John Smith may have bought it in 1710 and it may be the very house that Thomas Smith, innholder, used for an ordinary in 1707. But of this we cannot be sure. The only thing we can seem to affirm with any certainty is that it was probably erected prior to 1734.

The old house that now occupies the corner of Winter and Market streets was moved there some fifty years ago from its original location between the Baker house and Mr. Brown's. Christian Wainwright, the widow of John, bought this lot in 1741. There is no mention of a house in this deed, but in her deed of sale to Daniel Staniford, in 1748, the house is specified. It was built between these two dates.

JOHN PROCTOR'S HOUSE AND ITS NEIGHBORS

Three neighbors of the olden time were John Proctor, Thomas Wells and Samuel Younglove, and it has been affirmed so often, that it has become an axiom, that Mr. Samuel N. Baker's residence is the old Proctor house, that the ancient dwelling that stood where the Town House is was Wells's, and that Younglove occupied an ancient house, which disappeared long ago, farther along the street. If we search carefully we may arrive at a different conclusion.

John Proctor's lot, on which his house stood, occupied the square now bounded by South Main, Elm and County streets and the River. Of this there can be no doubt. Proctor sold to Thomas Firman in 1647, and in the following year, in the inventory of Firman's estate, Mr. Proctor's property was appraised at £18 10s., a low valuation indicating a small and cheap house with this amount of land. George Palmer owned it in 1651, as he sold then to Ralph Dix, and in 1661 Dix sold this 2½

acres and house to Ezekiel Woodward. Incidentally we learn where the house stood. Liberty was granted Cornet Whipple, in 1673, "to sett up a fulling mill at the smaller falls, near Ezekiel Woodward's house." Woodward's house then was on the County-street side of the lot, and where else should we naturally suppose it? County street, from the corner by the church to the river, was one of the most ancient thoroughfares. The present South Main street, on which the Baker house fronts, was not opened until 1646, when the cart bridge was built. Years after the bridge was built, in 1672, Ezekiel Woodward sold Shoreborne Wilson a half-acre tract, which had a frontage on the street, now called South Main, of seven rods, and was bounded by his lot on the south and east, and on the north, by "the Common and the River," which would indicate that the two rods "fisherman's way" was continuous along the river bank at that time. Seven rods, measured from the river bank, includes the site of the Baker mansion, and at this date, 1672, there is no evidence that any building of any sort had been erected on this lot.

Woodward sold the remainder of his land and house to John Hubbard in 1679. Hubbard sold to Nathaniel Rust, senior, 1685, one acre of this property, the eastern portion, with the house, reserving a right of way, where Elm street now is, and on the same day, he sold Shoreborne Wilson the remainder, the western part on South Main street, reserving one rod wide against Knowlton's fence for a right of way, as in the previous deed, no edifice being mentioned.

Wilson sold his house and an acre and half of land to John Lane in 1694. As he bought the vacant lot in 1672, the house was erected between these two dates, 1672 and 1694.

John Lane sold the property to Edward Bromfield and Francis Burroughs of Boston, in 1697, and from them it passed to Samuel Appleton in 1702. After his death, Jasper Waters and Jasper Waters, junior, of London,

linen drapers, creditors, possibly, of the deceased merchant, purchased the widow's right of dower, and sold the estate to Isaac Fitts, hatter, consisting now of a mansion or dwelling house, barn, etc., in the year 1734.

Fitts sold the northern corner of this property "near the southerly abutment of Town Bridge" to Thomas Burnam, junior, April 5, 1736; and now, for the first time, it is mentioned that a house and barn are located here. The conclusion of the matter is, therefore, that the Baker mansion is the old Shoreborne Wilson residence, built between 1672 and 1694, and that the old Ross tavern, as it came to be, now owned by Mr. Warren Boynton, was built between 1734 and 1736.

Thomas Wells's house and land came into the hands of Stephen Jordan, and were sold by him to Samuel Younglove, jr., and by him to George Hart. Various deeds make it plain that the house was on or near County street.

Samuel Younglove, senior, owned a lot, which fronted on South Main street, and his house is located pretty definitely by his deed of sale of house, barn and an acre of land to Dea. William Goodhue in 1669, and in Joseph Goodhue's deed to Isaac Fellows, junior, 1694. It stood not far from the old gambrel-roofed house on the estate of the late John Heard.

One word in this connection as to the site of the original Foot Bridge, alluded to in our earliest records. The record mentions that Thomas Wells's houselot was "on the further side the River, near the foot-bridge." Locating Wells on the corner of Elm and County streets, we may locate the Foot Bridge at the only natural and easy place for such a bridge in this vicinity. Originally the land on which the saw mill now stands was a rocky island, separated by a narrow stream only from the mainland on the south. A single tree trunk would have reached from the old highway to the island, another long log would have spanned the rocky river bed at its narrowest. A foot-bridge here would have afforded easy

access to the meeting house and the centre of the little community. Here, I believe, the foot-bridge of ancient Ipswich really was.

But the record remains, I am aware, that, in 1655, the Town "agreed with John Andrews, Junior, to bring so many sufficient rayles to the Bridge-foot as will cover the Bridge over the River, neare the mill for the sum of £3," and it has been assumed that thus the foot-bridge was near the mill.

But foot-bridge and bridge-foot differ as truly as a horse chestnut differs from a chestnut horse. The bridge-foot evidently means the end of the bridge, or the approach to the bridge, for the bridge in question is the cart-bridge as the record itself makes evident. Thus the same Mr. Andrews was granted six acres of salt marsh for gravelling "the one half the Bridge the rayles are laid," and John West is awarded as much more for the other half. No conceivable foot-bridge would have involved such large expense.

Confirmation of this sense of the word is found in the assignment of Isaiah Wood as surveyor of highways, "from the foot of the Town-bridge to the turning of the highway on this side Windmill-Hill," in 1678.

ON THE RIVER BANK

The river bank from the mill-dam to the Bridge was wholly unoccupied and ungranted as late as 1693, except one small lot by the dam, which was occupied by Samuel Ordway's blacksmith shop. In March of that year, the Selectmen laid out this stretch of land in twenty-three lots, ranging from thirty-six feet to eighteen feet in width, and granted them to as many individuals. It was stipulated by the Town that these lots were given "provided that they make up the banck strong front to ye low water mark and no further into the River, and that they build or front up their several parts within twelve months after this time, and that they build no further into the Street than the Committee shall see fit, and that

they cumber not the highway nor stop the water in the street, but make provision for the water to run free into the river under such buildings, and also that each man's part be sett out, and that each person provide and make a good way by paving a way four foot wide all along before ye said buildings for the conveniency of foot travellers, and to have posts sett up upon the outside to keep off Teams from spoyling the same, and that it be done with stone, or if they are timber, must be purchased of others, if they have not of their own timber."

These rigorous conditions discouraged the improvement of the lots. They reverted to the Town, apparently, for the most part. Robert Lord built a shop, and Mrs. Dean owned a house on this territory, prior to 1722. Rev. Augustine Caldwell identifies the Dean house with a dwelling that formerly occupied the site of the old lace factory now used as a tenement house.

Joseph Abbey received a grant, made a wall and built a house near Mrs. Dean's. In 1723, he petitioned the town for help, as his place had cost him more than he anticipated, and received ten pounds. His house was built about 1722, probably, and Mr. Caldwell states that this is the old house formerly occupied by Mr. Wesley K. Bell.

Nathaniel Fuller bought the lot assigned his brother Joseph, twenty-eight feet wide, in 1693. Thomas Knowlton bought Cornelius Kent's lot, eighteen feet wide, and sold to Fuller, whose lot was then forty-six feet in width. He built the wall, filled in the lot suitably for building, and erected a dwelling. Allusion to "Nathaniel Fuller, deceased" in 1726, shows that his house antedates that year. In 1739, Nathaniel Knowlton of Haverhill gave a quitclaim deed of the house, etc., of the late Nathaniel Fuller to Nathaniel Fuller, junior, tailor, and it is described as "joining the Town Bridge." This is the house owned by the late Mrs. Susan Trow. It had originally a central chimney stack.

Isaac Fitts, hatter, petitioned for forty feet on the

river bank, adjoining Fuller's land in 1726, that he might set a dwelling thereon. This was granted provided he built within two years. He built at once, for Joseph Abbe asked the Town in 1727 to add twenty feet more of the river bank to his former grant "the front to extend from the Easterly corner in a straight line toward Isaac Fitts's dwelling, which is the easterly corner of said Abbe's shop." Fitts sold to Arthur Abbott, innholder, for £240, in 1733, his house, shop, half the well, and eight rods of land, "being partly a grant made to Capt. Daniel Ringe, the other to me by the Town." The lot had sixty feet frontage, and abutted on the south on the land dwelt on by Jonathan Lord. Abbott sold to Cornelius Brown, of Boxford, for £370 bills of credit, bounded by Jonathan Lord and Nathaniel Fuller, in 1738. Daniel Brown, of Cambridge, sold to Daniel Badger, painter, in 1760; Mary Badger to Timothy Souther; one-fourth interest in 1794, bounded by Nathaniel Rust and John Kimball. This is the old "Souther" house, next south of Mr. Baker's store.

William Jones desired "the remaining part of the River's bank next Joseph Abbe's grant down the River to the place reserved for a highway which is about 60 feet," in 1727. This was granted him, and the Committee recommended that a way twenty feet wide to the river be reserved. This public way to the river remains, adjoining the property lately owned by Wesley K. Bell, Esq. The house, on the south side of this way, is the one erected by Mr. Jones at this time, now owned and occupied by Mr. Edward Ready.

The lot adjoining the twenty feet way in 1726 was granted Joseph Manning, who was desirous of settling in his native town, but had no dwelling place. It was eighty or ninety feet long. Dr. Manning built his house forthwith, and occupied it to the time of his death, 1786. By the provision made in his will, it then became the property of his daughter Anstice, wife of Francis Cogswell, who sold the house, warehouse, and one hundred

and six feet frontage, to Joseph Cogswell, in 1808. Here Joseph Green Cogswell, the eminent teacher of the Round Hill school and librarian of the Astor Library, was born. It is owned now by Mr. Josiah Stackpole.

The house between this and the Souther house is alluded to as occupied by Jonathan Lord as early as 1733, and was probably built about the time its neighbors were. It is quite a remarkable circumstance that six very comfortable houses stand here side by side, every one of which was built in the near vicinity of 1725.

A GROUP OF OLD HOUSES NEAR THE SOUTH GREEN

Richard Saltonstall owned fourteen acres, about eight acres of which lay to the south of the brook, then called Saltonstall's Brook, and frequently alluded to under that name, and the remainder north of it, extending from the highway to the river. This is the brook that crosses the road by Mr. Josiah Stackpole's soap factory. Mr. Saltonstall's house was somewhere north of the brook.

This whole property, including his mansion, he sold to Samuel Bishop representing the estate of Thomas Bishop, September, 1680. Job Bishop sold to Capt. Stephen Cross in 1684. Cross divided the property. In 1689, Nathaniel Rust was in possession of the part on the south of the brook. The half acre, north of the brook, fronting on the street was sold to Elisha Treadwell and by him to John Treadwell in 1689, and by him to Thomas Manning in 1691. Manning also acquired a rod more frontage in 1692 and a quarter of an acre in the rear in 1696. This tract did not include Saltonstall's house.

Capt. Stephen Cross left the remainder of his estate to his two minor sons, Stephen and John, in 1691; and in 1706, Stephen sold to Benjamin Dutch, sadler, his right and title to the dwelling house Dutch occupied, and the land for £65.

Dutch sold Thomas Norton, tanner, for £140 in 1730,

a house and six rods square of land, bounded by Manning and Dutch's other land and the highway. This is the house that now stands in dismal decay just opposite the Parsonage, and it seems to have been built between 1706 and 1730. Even if Dutch acquired only a half interest in the Cross house and five acres of land for £65 in 1706, the increase in value between that and £140 for a house and only thirty-six rods of land, indicates that a new house must have been erected on this site. At Mr. Norton's decease, it became the property of his widow. Subsequently Margaret Norton executed a deed of half of it to her brother, George Norton. Then it belonged to Thomas Appleton, to John Wade, etc.

Returning now to the south of the brook, Nathaniel Rust sold an acre, bounded by the brook and the street, including buildings, tan-yard, etc., to Thomas Norton in March, 1700, and in November of that year Norton married Mercy Rust, daughter of Mr. Nathaniel Rust. Mr. Rust, it will be remembered, was ordered to furnish the gloves for Mr. Cobbett's funeral in 1685.

In 1701, Rust sold his son-in-law the seven acres adjoining the tan-yard lot, and in 1710, he sold Norton and Daniel Ringe, who had married his two daughters, his house and land where the South Church now stands. Norton and Ringe sold out to Ammi Ruhamah Wise in 1723, and I suspect that, at this time, Deacon Norton, as he was then called, built the substantial house that stands today in excellent repair, under the great elm tree, and evincing in its interior finish a wealthy builder.

Thomas, the son of the Deacon, a Harvard graduate, and once teacher of the Grammar school, married Mrs. Mary Perkins in 1728, and his father took to wife the widow Mary Rayment of Beverly, 1729.

This double marrying seems to have resulted in the purchase of the Dutch house by the senior Thomas, in the following June, as Thomas Norton, junior, was witness to the signature.

Deacon Norton died in 1744, and Thomas, junior,

inherited the estate. Thomas Norton, junior, died in 1750. At his death, his widow was apportioned the "Dutch house" and its thirty-six rods of land. His son Thomas received the homestead, barn, bark-house, old house, Beam house, tan-yard and pits, half the little house, etc. The homestead was appraised at £226, 13, 4. In 1771, Norton sold the whole property to Dummer Jewett for £240, and in 1791, his widow sold it to the County of Essex "to be improved and used as a House of Correction." The prison was built near the site of the residence of the late Rhoda B. Potter, and the grounds inclosed with a high red fence. The old mansion was the keeper's residence. Many old people remember it while it served this use.

Despite its fresh appearance, the comfortable house lately owned and occupied by Mrs. Potter, is of venerable age. It was built on the corner now occupied by the Meeting House of the South Parish, and when that edifice was erected in 1837, it was removed to its present location. The well belonging to it remained visible until recently, in the old corridor in the cellar, near the door.

I presume from its interior architecture that the present house is identical with the one owned and occupied by Dr. Samuel Rogers, a prominent citizen, for many years, on the original site. Rogers purchased the property of Daniel Wise, in June, 1750. Wise received it from his father, Major Ammi Ruhamah Wise, son of the celebrated Rev. John Wise of the Chebacco Parish. Major Wise purchased from Daniel Ringe and Thomas Norton, in 1723, who bought the estate of Nathaniel Rust, their father-in-law, in 1710. Rust acquired the property, with a house and barn, on June 2, 1665, by purchase, from Deacon William Goodhue, but I am unable to find the deed of Goodhue's purchase. I presume it was a part of the original Younglove grant. It seems improbable that the house mentioned in the deed of 1665 should have been good enough in 1837 to be removed and repaired. The joint ownership of Ringe and Nor-

ton may indicate a double house at that period. It would not be hard to believe that Major Wise built it in the days of his prosperity, but this must be wholly a matter of surmise.

The old Wade mansion was built in 1728 and has always remained in the family. It was inherited by Nathaniel Wade, who served with conspicuous honor in the Revolutionary War. When Benedict Arnold went over to the British, Washington at once sent an order to Colonel Wade to take command of West Point and hold it, saying "We can trust him." The original military order, bearing Washington's signature is a priceless relic, now in the possession of Mr. Francis H. Wade. An attic room in this house has always been called "Pomp's" room. Pomp was a slave of the olden time, but a very jolly fellow with a gift for doggerel rhyme which was exercised on many occasions. One day, the tradition runs, he came back from town with the astounding news:

> "Here is more of old Choate's folly
> He's torn down the old bridge
> And turned out Walley."

The old town bridge was replaced by the stone bridge in 1764, and in the same year Rev. John Walley resigned his pastorate at the South Church. Colonel Choate was so conspicuous a citizen and official that his name is still borne by the bridge. He was very prominent in church affairs as well.

The worthy Thomas Norton, junior, owned a slave Phillis, valued in the inventory at £26, 13s. 4d. These old mansions are filled with weird memories. Pomp and Phillis are mementoes of slave life in our county.

The residence of Mr. F. T. Goodhue is venerable and interesting. Rev. John Rogers, in 1734, deeded his son Samuel, a physician, about half an acre here, described as "all yt part of my homestead or old orchard, lying before the land that was Mr. Francis Crompton's, from

the South corner, opposite said Crompton's land by a strait line to ye street or highway, with all building, trees, etc." It hardly seems likely that the house would not have been mentioned specifically if it were then built.

Dr. Rogers sold his dwelling house, land, etc., to John Walley, first pastor of the South Church, and Mr. Walley sold it to his successor, Joseph Dana, in 1766, "excepting the hangings being painted canvass in the Front Room, nearest to the meeting house, as also the hangings in the chamber over said room which, it is mutually agreed, said Joseph Dana shall take down with all convenient speed and deliver to said John Walley at his order."

I should judge from the deeds that Samuel Rogers built the house in 1734 or subsequently.

Old people remember an ancient house, that stood near the corner of the Heard land, facing the east. This was the home of Col. John Choate, Esq., in early days, and was purchased by him of the heirs of Francis Crompton. Crompton bought the land, three acres, without any sure mention of a house in the deed, in 1693. Averill, the earlier owner, was a poor man, if I associate the correct inventory with his name. Crompton probably built the house. It fell into decay and was removed more than fifty years ago.

Before leaving this locality, it may be of interest if we trace the outline of the original Saltonstall property, since it establishes incidentally several interesting facts.

We have mentioned that the Thomas Manning property and the Thomas Norton property included an acre or more of the Saltonstall estate. Benjamin Dutch sold a lot containing thirty square rods, six rods frontage and five rods depth, adjoining Mr. Norton to Joseph Appleton in 1730 for £72. It is styled a "certain piece of upland" and no house was included in the purchase. But Joseph Appleton had a house here some years later, and it is likely that he built it about the time of his purchase. A well near the street in Mr. Theodore Cogs-

well's vacant corner lot here may have been Appleton's well. It is interesting to note the fact that, although the deeds mention this house repeatedly, it disappeared so long ago that no remembrance or tradition of its existence has survived. The remainder of the Saltonstall property, four acres less or more, was sold by Benjamin to Nathaniel Dutch, for £150 in 1737. It was bounded on the northeast partly by Rev. Mr. Rogers' land and partly by common land, that is, the old training field; but it embraced quite a portion of the present Common, for the Joseph Appleton lot was bounded by it on the north.

Nathaniel Dutch sold 95 rods in 1733 to William Story, Esq., Isaac Dodge and Samuel Lord, jr., a committee of the First Parish, and Joseph Appleton, Esq., John Baker, Esq., and Isaac Smith, gentleman, a committee of the South Parish, "for the purposes of a burying yard forever." "Beginning at the east corner thereof at a stake in Dutch's line, twelve feet southeast of the southeast corner of said John Baker's homestall," it was bounded thirteen and one-half rods on Baker's land, then seven rods on the west side on Dutch. It was a rectangular lot, 13½ rods by 7. The remainder of his four acres was mortgaged by Dutch to William McKean (the deeds mention "about five acres") in 1785. McKean acquired possession and sold to Dr. John Manning in 1793.

Manning sold John Wade, a strip of "twenty-one feet deep and as wide as the land he had bought lately of Thomas Appleton" in 1794. In July of that year he sold the town, for £13, 10s., "twenty-two square rods of land lying on the road opposite the house of Col. Nathaniel Wade, beginning four feet from the easterly corner of the house lately owned by Joseph Appleton, Esq., deceased, in front toward the road and extending northerly as the wall now stands to a stake and stones in the training field, and from thence southeast to the old road, thence on the old bounds on the road to the

first bounds mentioned, for the purpose of widening the road for the convenience of the public." It would appear from this that the road was much narrower then than now.

In May, 1795, Dr. Manning sold the two Parishes a piece of land adjoining the burying ground, "beginning one rod and a half from the southeast corner of the old burying place in a right line toward the road, then south four rods, then west 20 rods, then north seven rods, and along the burying ground a width of fourteen rods, a depth of thirteen and one-half rods on the Baker line and of twenty rods on the southerly side. A second enlargement was made, not many years ago, when Rev. John Cotton Smith purchased the land of William Kinsman, which has been divided into lots on the south side of the yard. In June, 1795, Manning sold Thomas Baker an acre of land between the burying ground and the river, and in May of that year, he had sold the town for 5s, "from desire of accommodating the Town with a more convenient training field; beginning at the southeast corner of the homestead of the heirs of John Baker, Esq., deceased, thence southeast to land I lately sold the inhabitants of the Town, thence southwest until it comes within four rods and 6 feet of the house formerly owned by Joseph Appleton, Esq., thence west northerly til it strikes the burying ground 23 feet to the north of the southerly corner thereof, thence northeast to the bounds first mentioned, containing about half an acre."

The curious antiquarian can locate these lines with approximate accuracy, and it appears probable, that if the stone wall now separating the burying ground from the Heard estate were prolonged in the direction it runs until it reached well into the present highway, we should have the northern bound roughly traced of the original Saltonstall grant. The training field and Green were much smaller therefore than today.

While this boundary of the Saltonstall estate is fresh in mind, attention may well be given to a claim made

by the widow of President John Rogers, who then occupied the estate of Rev. Nathaniel Rogers, to land now included in the Common or the public thoroughfare, by virtue of a grant of six acres made by John Winthrop in 1634. In the town record, under date of April 8, 1686, the entry is made:

"Whereas, Mrs. Rogers claimeth part of the land without the line from the gate and stable end, upon a line to the land of Mr. Saltonstall's, and some land in the end of the now orchard before the land of William Avory's, all this upon the satisfaction of a grant of land to Mr. Winthrop of six acres of land in 1634.

"Voted and granted that, provided that Mrs. Rogers give in to the Selectmen in the Town's behalf, that she and her heirs shall secure the Town from any further demand for satisfaction of said grant from Mr. Winthrop and his heirs and her and her heirs, that then the Town will pay to said Mrs. Rogers within one year the sum of ten pounds in Common pay, and she secure the Town from any claims of herself or her heirs, from the land on the outside of a straight line, from the said gate to Mr. Saltonstall's fence, formerly as the stable end stands, and from all the land on this end of the now orchard covering the length of four rayles as the fence stands upon a square from the paile fence to William Avory's fence, then the said sum shall be paid by the Town."

The original deed with seals and signatures is in the Town Record, and it provides "that the said land laid downe shall lie common and be not impropriated by any particular future grant to any person or persons."

Further specification is made in the deed of "a straight line from the fence of Stephen Cross formerly Richard Saltonstall's, Esq., ranging to her gate post, and so stretching the length of four rails beyond the causeway end, and then on a square to the fence of William Averill's."

The meaning must be guessed out for neither Resolution nor Deed is luminous. I have always interpreted

this transaction as securing the Town's title to the land bordering on Mr. F. T. Goodhue's property, and some portion of the old training field. One fact is beyond question. Mr. Winthrop's "six acres near the River," granted in 1634, included the whole or part of the fine open meadow belonging to the Heard estate. This belonged to the Rogerses, and Rogers must have purchased from John Winthrop.

THE "WINTHROP HOUSE," SO CALLED

The name of Winthrop has been associated with the old Burnham house on the Argilla Road, now occupied by Mr. Perley Lakeman, but without reason.

In 1636-7, the town granted George Giddings about 16 acres of land, meadow and upland, having the highway to Chebacco on the northeast. In 1667, Giddings sold Thomas Burnham "my dwelling house, wherein said Thomas now dwelleth" and twelve acres of land, bounded north by Mr. Jonathan Wade's land, west and south by land of Rev. Nathaniel Rogers, and east by the highway leading to Chebacco.

Giddings owned no other land on this road, and the bounds given locate it beyond a doubt. Generations of Burnhams possessed it, until the sale to the present owner a few years since.

There is not a scrap of documentary evidence, known to me, that suggests Winthrop's ownership. As for the house itself, Dr. Lyon, of Hartford, an expert in olden architecture, pronounces it to have been built in the latter part of the seventeenth century or the early years of the following one.

THE HOWARD HOUSE

Fronting the new stone bridge, on Turkey Shore, is the well preserved "Howard house" as it is sometimes called. Mr. Caldwell in his Notes to the Hammatt papers states that it was owned by Aaron Wallis, half a cen-

tury ago. Before him Capt. Ebenezer Caldwell, who died in 1821, was its possessor. His first wife was Lucy, daughter of Samuel Ringe. Ringe bought the property of Stephen Howard, who inherited it in 1766 on the death of his father, Samuel Howard. Samuel bought the shares owned by his brothers William and John at his father's, William Howard's, death. To this it may be added, Howard bought six acres of land with the dwelling in 1679 of Uzal Wardell. Susanna Ringe, the wife of Wardell, junior, sold her father-in-law, Uzal Wardell, her third of her father's, Daniel Ringe's estate in 1669. Ringe bought of Thomas Emerson in 1648, a dwelling house and six acres of land by original grant.

Is this house the same that Daniel Ringe bought in 1648? I cannot believe it, though the deeds are continuous. The question of identity, which was stated in the beginning of this series of papers, is well illustrated in the case. The probability of such extreme antiquity is very slight. Judging from its architecture, Dr. Lyon believes this house was built near the beginning of the last century.

THE HOVEY HOUSE

The ancient Hovey house, last used as a barn by Mr. Foss, but, unfortunately, now a thing of the past, is generally assumed to have been built in 1668, because Daniel Hovey was granted permission to fell trees "for a house" that year. More pertinent evidence is the grant of the previous year, 1667, to Daniel Hovey, "to fell timber for a ——— and repayring his house." A house that needed repairing in 1667 is not likely to have defied the tooth of Time for two hundred and twenty-seven years longer, and then, still stout and strong, have suffered destruction only by fire.

THE REGINALD FOSTER ESTATE

The same question of identity confronts us in the fine old mansion, now owned by Mr. Daniel S. Burnham, on

Water street. The pedigree of this property is beyond question. Charlotte Burnham, wife of Abraham, purchased half of it in 1862, from Enoch P. Fuller. He bought it of Nathaniel Fuller in 1840. Fuller purchased from Thomas Dodge in 1796, Dodge from John Holland in 1792, Holland from John Harris in 1778. Richard Sutton and Elizabeth, his wife, sold Abner Harris, shipwright, the southwest end of the dwelling house, "late our honored grandfather's, Jacob Foster deceased," in 1758. Jacob Foster, father of this Jacob, I presume, received it from Reginald Foster. Reginald Foster bought of Roger Preston in 1655, a house and land reaching from the present Green street to Summer street.

Again, I cannot believe this house identical with the house of 1655, but make no assertion as to its probable age.

THE NORTON-CORBETT HOUSE

This fine old mansion, venerable in its architecture, hallowed with its association with the great and good men of the early days, has long been counted the most historic house of Ipswich, and possibly the oldest. An honest desire to establish its antiquity, and confirm its legendary renown, impelled me to very careful study of every document that I could discover. To my own chagrin, the conclusion, to which candor has impelled me, divests the old landmark of all its poetry, and much of its age. A review of the grounds leading to this may not be uninteresting to those that have the love of antiquarian lore.

In the year 1638, Thomas Firman sold Rev. John Norton a house and lot "which said lot was granted first unto Mr. John Fawne in the year 1634," and by him sold to Firman. The boundaries given locate the property unmistakably.

In this house, or a better one of his own building, Mr. Norton dwelt until he resigned his pastorate and re-

moved to Boston as the successor of Rev. John Cotton. His successor, Rev. Mr. Cobbett, occupied his house and eventually purchased it. At his decease, the estate became the property of his widow. In 1696, his son John sold the house and three acres of land for £70 to Major Francis Wainwright, who owned the Robert Payne estate adjoining.

After a few months ownership, Major Wainwright sold to John Annable "Taylor" for £24 — "A house that was formerly in the tenure of John Cobbett, late of Ipswich, with the land on which said house standeth, and also all the land before the said house to the street, together with four foot breadth northerly from said house, and four foot easterly from said house, these three points all bounded by said Wainwright's land and southerly by the Highway or Street, the westerly line that comes to said street to take in but half the well, and the easterly line to run straight from four foot of from the said house to the said street." March 9, 1696-7.

Evidently Major Wainwright retained the land that originally belonged with the house, and a few years later he sold to Matthew Perkins, land and the orchard upon it, "bounded by John Baker's land on the East, the Highway on the South, the land of John Annible and said Wainwright on the West, as the old wall formerly stood, the land of Wainwright on the North, as the wall stands, also the common right bought of John Cobbett." October 11, 1701.

The Perkins property thus lay between the old Cobbett house and Baker's.

The Cobbett house with its four feet of land on three sides was sold by Annable to William Stone for £35 with Wainwright on three sides and half of the well, etc. March 16, 1701.

Stone sold his house with one-quarter of an acre to Robert Holmes, tailor, for £40, bounded easterly by Capt. Matthew Perkins, west and north by Wainwright. January 20, 1710-11.

Stone had bought of Wainwright "3 foot in front next ye street joining on the westerly side of the land he bought of John Annable and to run until it comes to nothing at the north corner of said line," for £3, 12s. This he assigned to Holmes on the same date, so that the western line was now seven feet from the house on the front, and included the whole well.

Robert Holmes sold his son Robert Holmes, junior, taylor, "a certain parcel of land on the South East side of my homestead, beginning at ye easterly corner next Capt. Matthew Perkins his homestead and from there to extend North West 15 feet into my homestead, from thence to run on a straight line keeping equal distance from Perkins's land to ye country road, and up said road Southerly to ye corner of said Perkins's homestead, and by said Perkins's homestead to ye bound first mentioned, as also all my right, title and interest in ye new end of ye dwelling house standing on said bounded premises." February 20, 1732-3.

In accordance with the terms of his father's will Robert Holmes, junior, succeeded to the whole estate at his mother's death. He enlarged the estate by purchasing of Thomas Staniford, innholder, for £3, a small piece of land adjoining the northeast side of the homestead of Robert Holmes, late of Ipswich, deceased, about three rods, bounded south by homestead, southwest and northwest by Staniford, northeast by land of widow Esther Perkins. April 10, 1742.

Administration was granted on the estate of Robert Holmes to Samuel and Abigail Heard, September, 1776.

"Samuel Heard, cordwainer, and Abigail, his wife, being the only child and heir of Robert Holmes, late of Ipswich, Taylor," for £33, 6, 8, sell "Nathaniel March, Taylor, a dwelling house, with small parcel of land under and adjoining, part of the real estate of our honored father, beginning at Southeast corner by land of Abraham Caldwell, thence by said Caldwell's land easterly, 6 rods and 10 feet, thence northerly by land of

Capt. Thomas Staniford, one rod, eleven feet and a half, thence westerly on land of the said Abigail Heard 6 rods 10 feet, and thence southerly one rod, 9½ feet by Highway, also the privilege of using the well on the other part of deceased real estate." March 1, 1777.

Nathaniel March sold to Nathaniel March, junior, for $900, the house and fifteen rods of land, bounded southeasterly by Daniel Russell six rods ten feet, northerly by Staniford one rod eleven and one-half feet, westerly by Abigail Heard six rods ten feet, southerly by highway one rod nine and one-half feet, with privilege of using the well on said Abigail's land; Nathaniel and Elizabeth, his wife, to have the privilege of the use of the northwest room of said house, during their natural life. November 21, 1796.

The portion of the Holmes property, which Samuel and Abigail Heard reserved when they sold the house to March, was sold by them to Samuel Heard, junior, and Ebenezer, beginning at the north corner on land of heirs of Staniford on the street, southerly by street one rod nine and one-half feet, to land of Nathaniel March, easterly on March's land six rods ten feet, northerly by Staniford's land one rod seven and one-half feet, westerly on Staniford's land six rods ten feet. May 19, 1803. Samuel, junior, and Ebenezer Heard sold this plot, "part of garden spot formerly owned by Nathaniel March," for $30 to Elizabeth March. April 8, 1808.

Nathaniel and Hannah March sold to Daniel Russell for $80 "a certain dwelling house with land under and adjoining containing 15 rods, beginning at the south corner by highway and land of Daniel Russell, thence north west by said highway 1 rod 9 feet and ½ to land of Elizabeth March, thence northeasterly by Elizabeth's land 6 rods and 10 feet to land of heirs of Thomas Staniford, thence south easterly 1 rod 11½ feet to land of Russell, southwesterly by land of Russell 6 rods 10 feet to Highway, being the same I purchased of my late father, Nathaniel March by deed November 21, 1796,"

and on the same day Elizabeth March sold the garden spot adjoining to Russell for $40.

Daniel Russell sold his son, Foster Russell, for $76 "a certain piece or parcel of land situate, lying and being in Ipswich aforesaid, formerly owned by Nathaniel March, deceased, containing 14 rods more or less, beginning at the southerly corner thereof by the highway and my own land, thence running north westerly 38 feet to land owned by the Methodist Society, thence by land of said Society to land of Dr. Thomas Manning, thence south easterly by Manning 36 feet to my own land, thence south westerly by my own land to highway." August 30, 1833.

Thus there is not a link lacking in the chain. From Firman and Norton, we trace the ownership of the house, through Cobbett, Wainwright, Annable, Stone, the Holmeses, and the Marches to Daniel Russell. Russell bought the house and land in 1818. In 1833, he sold the land to Foster Russell, but there is no mention of any house. Evidently it had disappeared.

But what of the old house still standing?

It is well remembered that Richard Sutton owned the southeast half of this dwelling, and Daniel Russell the northwest half. Russell bought this half of Abraham Caldwell of Beverly in 1796, bounded northwesterly partly on land of Nathaniel March, southeasterly on land of Richard Sutton.

Caldwell purchased of Samuel Sawyer in 1772, Robert Holmes abutting on the northwest. Ephraim Kindall bought this half of Jonathan Newmarsh in 1768, who bought of Benjamin Brown in 1762. Brown acquired it in 1754, by purchase, of William Dodge, of Lunenberg, and Esther, his wife, and Samuel Williams, junior.

Dodge's deed recites that the line of division beginning at a stake by land of Robert Holmes, extends to a stake standing in the middle of the homestead of Capt. Matthew Perkins, late of Ipswich, thence southwesterly to a stake, thence northwesterly twenty-two feet through

the middle of the curb of the well to a stake standing near, thence southwesterly through the dwelling house and middle of the chimney to the street, with one-half the dwelling, with all privileges, etc., settled by a Commission appointed and impowered by the Court of Probate to divide the estate of said Matthew Perkins to and among his two daughters, Esther Harbin and Mary Smith, according to his will. Williams sold the interest he bought of William Harbin.

Among the filed papers relating to the estate of Capt. Matthew Perkins, we find the divisions of the real estate between Esther Harbin and Mary Smith in 1749. Esther received the northwest half, the division line being defined word by word as in the deed of Dodge to Brown. Mary received the southeast half. Esther left her estate to her four children to whom it was apportioned in 1752. Her heirs sold to Brown.

Capt. Matthew Perkins, we observed at the beginning, bought the Norton-Cobbett orchard in 1701. Between that date and 1709, he built the house, for in the latter years he gave his son Matthew his former homestead, lower down the street.

The present old house is, therefore, Capt. Matthew Perkins' mansion, and the Norton-Cobbett house stood very near on the northwest side, but has long since disappeared.

Every item of evidence corroborates this identification. The successive deeds of the old Cobbett property mention Captain Matthew, the widow Esther Perkins, Abraham Caldwell and Daniel Russell as eastern abutters. The deeds of the present house mention Holmes and March as western neighbors. The well of the present house is precisely where the deeds locate it; the Cobbett well was on the west side of the house. This house stands near the road; the other must have stood back somewhat, as the land covered by the house with only four feet on each of three sides and the frontage measured about a quarter of an acre.

The present Foster Russell house, by the measurements of the deeds, occupies a part of the site of the old one. Finally, Mrs. Susan Lakeman, the daughter of the late Daniel Russell, was born in the Perkins' mansion in 1815. She remembers distinctly that it was always said that her father tore down an old house close by in 1818, called "the March house." In that year he bought the property of Nathaniel March.

As to the old Cobbett well, it is beyond question identical with the well that still remains in the cellar of the Foster Russell house, which served as a public watering place for many years, I am informed, before the house was built, and still supplies Mr. Augustine Spiller by a pipe that pierces the cellar wall.

THE JOHN POTTER HOUSE

The well-preserved old mansion beneath the spreading elms on the corner of East street and "Hog Lane," as the ancient nickname was, — "Brooke Street" as it is recorded in the old deeds, — is of much interest.

This lot was owned in 1648 by Francis Jordan, the town-whipper, whose gruesome business it was to wield the lash and lay it smartly upon the backs of evil-doers, at the public whipping-post. In 1655, there was a house here, occupied by Jeffrey Skelling or Snelling, a man of questionable character, who tasted the lash more than once. I can hardly believe that a man of his proclivities was likely to occupy so fine a house.

Richard Belcher of Charlestown sold, to John Potter, for £88, in 1708, the two acres in this corner, with all the buildings, including the "old house, new out-houses, etc." The mention of an "old house" at this date renders it very improbable that the present building was then in existence.

A few years ago, the slope of the hill on the east side of the present house was dug away, and an old cellar was disclosed. Two old spoons of a style in vogue prior

to 1700 were found. Very likely this was the site of the old Francis Jordan property, and John Potter probably built the present mansion subsequent to 1708.

SOME OLD HIGH-STREET DWELLINGS

A few more old mansions, on High street, must not be overlooked. Here again that question of identity disturbs us in the case of the old Caldwell house.

Richard Betts sold to Cornelius Waldo, for £30, his dwelling house, land, etc., in 1652. Waldo sold the same property to John Caldwell, in 1654 for £26. John Caldwell's estate, about the year 1692, was inventoried, the house, land at home and three acres of other land at £109. This three-acre lot is probably identical with the "four acres, be it more or less, within the Common fields, neare unto Muddy River," which he bought of William Buckley, and which Buckley had bought for £7 of Thomas Manning in 1657. The homestead was valued, then, at about a hundred pounds sterling. Caldwell bought it for £26, occupied it some forty years, and left it worth £100. It has been said that record remains of enlargement, etc., but repairs and enlargement sufficient to enhance the value nearly four times must have been very destructive of the original Waldo house, I fear. It is more likely that Caldwell built the present house, and its architecture points to the latter years of the seventeenth century as the time of its erection.

The fine mansion, lately purchased and improved by Mr. John B. Brown, is the colonial home Rev. Nathaniel Rogers built for himself in 1727-8.

The very old house, the home of Mr. Caleb Lord, until his death, and its larger neighbor, the old Jacob Manning house, afford a very fascinating study. Mr. Lord informed me that this house was owned by his father, "Capt. Nat.," and his predecessor was "Deacon Caleb." Caleb Lord, Hatter, and Daniel Low, bought it with eighteen rods of land in 1751, of Job Harris. Harris

bought the dwelling, barn, and two and three-fourths acres of land of Rev. Jabez Fitch, when he left the pastorate of the Ipswich First Church in 1727 and went to Portsmouth. There was at this time but one dwelling on this goodly lot of nearly three acres. Harris sold Caleb Lord the house, etc., "at the north corner of the homestead," but he resided still in another house on the same lot, and, in 1770, bequeathed his son John the southerly half of his dwelling. The other heirs sold out to John in 1772. John Harris sold to the town, in 1795, about two acres with the buildings. This purchase was made to secure a Poor-house, and considerable changes were made then and later to fit it for its new use. Mr. Caleb Lord remembers that the door was on the end toward the street.

When the town purchased the present Poor Farm, this property was sold to Jacob Manning, jr., in May, 1818. The deed describes it, as the work-house and land, "beginning at the corner of Nathaniel Lord's land, 12 feet 1 inch from his shop, on said High street East to land of heirs of James Harris deceased, Westerly 5 rods 12½ links to land this day conveyed to Lord, *i. e.* wood house and turf or peat house, and the pump with the rigging and gear thereto belonging, also reserving to John Lord 4th, liberty to remove the building called the pest house and chimney and underpinning stones."

This is the large house on the south corner of Manning street. I think that Job Harris built it for his new residence and then sold the older Fitch house to Caleb Lord. This surmise is confirmed by the purchase that Mr. Fitch made of about four rods of land on the back side of his house from Francis Young in 1708. It was a piece one rod wide from the land or house of Mr. Fitch, and extended in a straight line one rod broad to the northerly end of his barn or woodhouse. This shows that the Fitch house occupied the extreme corner of the lot. This land may have been needed for the enlargement that has been made on this side. Mr.

Fitch bought the house with an acre and a half of land of William Payne and his wife Mary, the only daughter of William Stewart, deceased, in the year 1704, for £150. In 1719, he enlarged the lot by purchasing an acre of Thomas and Alexander Lovell fronting on the street and joining his land on the south.

Stewart bought of Roger Derby, who had removed to Salem in 1692. Derby or Darby bought a house and two acres of Philip Fowler in 1672, and in 1652 John Hassell owned a house here. Hassell was the original grantee. Again the query arises, who was the builder of the present decrepit dwelling? Certainly it was owned by Job Harris and there is no reason for doubting Fitch's ownership, or even Stewart's. Beyond Stewart, or possibly Derby, I do not venture, but there is no absolute limit, save that it is incredible that it was Hassell's original house.

I wonder if Stewart occupied this house before he bought it? If he did, peculiar interest attaches to the narrative of John Dunton, a book pedler, who visited Ipswich, in the course of his saddle-bag peregrinations, in 1685 or 1686. In any event, the gossipy description of the Stewarts will not be unwelcome. Dunton wrote to his wife, minutely enough to satisfy her womanly curiosity, after this fashion:

"My Landlady, Mrs. Wilkins, having a sister at Ipswich which she had not seen for a great while, Mrs. Comfort, her daughter (a young gentlewoman equally happy in the perfections both of her body and mind), had a great desire to see her aunt, having never been at her house, nor in that part of the country; which Philaret having a desire to see, and being never backward to accomodate the Fair Sex, profers his service to wait upon her thither, which was readily accepted by the young lady, who felt herself safe under his protection. Nor were her parents less willing to trust her with him. All things being ready for our ramble, I took my fair one up behind me and rid on our way, I and my Fair Fel-

low Traveller to Mr. Steward's whose wife was Mrs. Comfort's own Aunt: whose Joy to see her Niece at Ipswich was sufficiently Expressed by the Noble Reception we met with and the Treatment we found there; which far outdid whate'er we cou'd have thought. And tho myself was but a stranger to them, yet the extraordinary civility and respect they shewed me, gave me reason enough to think I was very welcome. It was late when we came thither, and we were both very weary, which yet would not excuse us from the trouble of a very splendid supper, before I was permitted to go to bed; which was got ready in so short a time as would have made us think, had we not known the contrary, that it had been ready provided against we came. Though our supper was extraordinary yet I had so great a desire to go to bed, as made it to me a troublesome piece of kindness. But this being happily over, I took my leave of my Fellow Traveller, and was conducted to my apartment by Mrs. Stewart herself, whose character I shant attempt to-night, being so weary, but reserve till to-morrow morning. Only I must let you know that my apartment was so noble and the furniture so suitable to it, that I doubt not but even the King himself has oftentimes been contented with a worser lodging.

"Having reposed my self all night upon a bed of Down, I slept so very soundly that the Sun, who lay not on so soft a bed as I, had got the start of me, and risen before me; but was so kind however as to make me one of his first visits, and to give me the BON JOUR; on which I straight got up and dressed myself, having a mind to look about me and see where I was: and having took a view of Ipswich, I found it to be situated by a river, whose first rise from a Lake or Pond was twenty miles up, breaking of its course through a hideous swamp for many miles, a harbor for bears; it issueth forth into a large bay, where they fish for whales, due East over against the Island of Sholes, a great place for fishing. The mouth of that river is barred. It is a good

haven town. Their Meeting House or church is built very beautifully. There is a store of orchards and gardens about it, and good land for Cattel and husbandry.

"But I remember I promised to give you Mrs. Stewards Character, & if I hadn't yet gratitude and justice would exact it of me. Her stature is of a middle size, fit for a woman. Her face is still the magazine of beauty, whence she may fetch artillery enough to Wound a thousand lovers; and when she was about 18, perhaps there never was a face more sweet and charming — nor could it well be otherwise, since now at 33, all you call sweet and ravishing is in her Face; which it is as great a Pleasure to behold as a perpetual sunshine without any clouds at all; and yet all this sweetness is joined with such attractive vertue as draws all to a certain distance and there detains them with reverence and admiration, none ever daring to approach her nigher, or having power to go farther off. She's so obliging, courteous and civil as if those qualities were only born with her, and rested in her bosom as their centre. Her speech and her Behaviour is so gentle, sweet and affable, that whatsoever men may talk of magick there in none charms but she. So good a wife she is, she frames her nature to her husband's: the hyacinth follows not the Sun more willingly, than she her husband's pleasure. Her household is her charge. Her care to that makes her but seldom a non-resident. Her pride is to be neat and cleanly, and her thirst not to be Prodigal. And to conclude is both wise and religious, which makes her all I have said before.

"In the next place I suppose yourself will think it reasonable that unto Mrs. Stewards I should add her husband's Character: whose worth and goodness do well merit. As to his stature tis inclining to tall: and as to his aspect, if all the lineaments of a sincere and honest hearted man were lost out of the world, they might be all retrieved by looking on his face. He's one whose bounty is limited by reason, not by ostentation;

and to make it last he deals discreetly; as we sowe our land not by the sack but by the handful. He is so sincere and upright that his word and his meaning never shake hands and part, but always go together. His mind is always so serene that that thunder but rocks him asleep which breaks other men's slumbers. His thoughts have an aim as high as heaven, tho their residence be in the Valley of an humble heart. He is not much given to talk, tho he knows how to do it as well as any man. He loves his friend, and will do anything for him except it be to wink at his faults, of which he will be always a severe reprover. He is so good a husband that he is worthy of the wife he enjoys, and would even make a bad wife good by his example.

"Ipswich is a country town not very large, and when a stranger arrives, tis quickly known to every one. It is no wonder then that the next day after our arrival the news of it was carried to Mr. Hubbard, the Minister of the town, who hearing that I was the person that had brought over a great Venture of Learning, did me the honor of making me a visit at Mr. Steward's, where I lay, and afterwards kindly invited me and my fellow traveller to his own house, where he was pleased to give us very handsome entertainment. His writing of the History of Indian Warrs shews him to be a person of good parts and understanding. He is a sober, grave and well accomplished man — a good preacher (as all the town affirm, for I didn't hear him) and one that lives according to his preaching.

"The next day I was for another Ramble in which Mr. Steward was pleas'd to accompany me. And the place we went to was a town call'd Rowley, lying six miles North-East from Ipswich, where most of the Inhabitants had been Clothiers. There was that Day a great Game of Foot Ball to be playd, which was the occasion of our going thither: There was another Town that playd against them, as is sometimes Common in England: but they played with their bare feet which

I thought was very odd: but was upon a broad Sandy Shoar free from Stones, which made it more easie. Neither were they so apt to trip up one anothers heels, and quarrel as I have seen em in England."

With this bit of romance, I conclude my present study of the old houses of Ipswich. Many more remain to be investigated, and unsuspected rewards may await the diligent student. In due time I hope every old dwelling will have its history carefully written.

My aim has been not so much to exhaust the field, for this is impossible, nor to pronounce final judgments, as to illustrate the only sure way of approximating the truth. The work must be done cautiously and candidly, with a mind open to the truth, however sharp the conflict with cherished traditions or deeply seated prejudices. Resort must always be made to original documents. Regard must be had to inherent probabilities. Results obtained by the application of this method may fairly be considered a contribution to the permanent history of our town.

The conclusion to which we must come is that many houses are not as sold as they have been thought; that many substantial houses have passed away; that the history of one house is very easily transferred to another; that tradition is very unhistoric; that definite decision is impossible in many cases; but that, after all allowance is made, a remarkable number of ancient dwellings, still in use, were built in the earlier half of the last century, and a few remain from the closing decades of the seventeenth century, which were built before all the pioneers who knew Winthrop, and cleared the wilderness and built the town had passed away.

INDEX OF HOUSES

WITH NAME OF PRESENT OWNER, OR THAT BY WHICH IT IS COMMONLY KNOWN.

PAGE

Abbey, Joseph, house, ... 61
(Mr. Wesley K. Bell's old house)

Appleton, Col. John, ... 53
(Mr. Geo. D. Wildes's residence)

Appleton, Joseph, ... 67

Baker, Joseph, ... 56

Baker, Samuel N., ... 57

Boynton, Warren, ... 59
(Ross Tavern)

Brown, John B., ... 80

Burnham, Daniel S., ... 72

Caldwell, John, ... 80

Campbell, Charles A., ... 48

Choate, Col. John, ... 67

Dana, Rev. Joseph, ... 66
(Mr. Frank T. Goodhue's residence)

Dean, ... 61

Donnton, William, ... 48

Dunton's, John, narrative, ... 82

Fitts, Isaac, ... 59
(Souther house)

Foot-Bridge, ... 59

Foster, Reginald, ... 72
(Mr. Dan. S. Burnham's residence)

Fuller, Nathaniel, ... 61
(Mrs. Susan Trow's late residence)

Goodhue, Frank T., ... 66

Howard, William, ... 71

Hovey, Daniel, ... 72

Jones, William, ... 62
(Mr. Edward Ready's residence)

Kinsman, William, ... 49
Lord, Dea. Caleb, ... 80
Lord, Jonathan, ... 63
Manning, Dr. Joseph, ... 62
(Mr. Josiah Stackpole's residence)
Mill, Garden, ... 52
Norton-Cobbett, so-called, ... 64, 78
Norton, Dea. Thomas 63, 64
Poor, house, High Street, ... 81
(Jacob Manning house)
Potter, John, ... 79
Potter, Mrs. Rhoda B., ... 65
Proctor, John, ... 57
Ready, Edward, ... 62
Rogers, Rev. Nath., ... 80
(Mr. John B. Brown's residence)
Ross Tavern, ... 59
Saltonstall, Richard, ... 52, 63
South Burying Ground, ... 68, 69
South Common, ... 69, 70
Souther, Timothy, ... 62
Sparks's Ordinary 54
Stackpole, Josiah, ... 63
Training-field, ... 69
Treadwell Tavern, ... 56
(Joseph Baker house)
Trow, Mrs. Susan, ... 61
Wade, Col. Nath., ... 66
Wainwright, Christian, ... 57
Wells, Thomas, ... 59
Whipple, John, ... 50
(called the Saltonstall house)
Wildes, George D., ... 53
Winthrop, John (so-called) 71
Younglove, Samuel, Senior, ... 59

THE IPSWICH HISTORICAL SOCIETY

The Annual Meeting of the Ipswich Historical Society was held on Monday evening, December 3, 1928. The officers elected were as follows:

Honorary President—Francis R. Appleton

Acting President—Ralph W. Burnham.

Vice Presidents—Robert S. Kimball, James H. Proctor,

Secretary—Mrs. T. F. Waters.

Treasurer—Charles M. Kelly.

Directors—Miss Sarah E. Lakeman, Henry S. Spaulding, Dr. Frank W. Kyes, Amos E. Jewett.

Trustees—Joseph I. Horton, Charles M. Kelly, Robert S. Kimball.

ANNUAL REPORT

FOR THE YEAR ENDING NOVEMBER 30, 1928.

Dec. 1, 1927, Balance	$765.52	Fuel	$58.85
Received:		Printing	11.00
Annual dues	479.00	Water	4.00
Life membership fee	50.00	Postage	39.74
Books sold	20.62	Insurance	150.38
Annual supper	266.40	Repairs	40.08
Visitors' fees	208.25	Interest	55.36
		Addressograph plates	15.50
		Tranferred to Capital Account	600.00
		Miscellaneous	7.95
		Balance, Nov. 30, 1928	806.93
	$1,789.79		$1,789.79

IN ACCOUNT WITH IPSWICH SAVINGS BANK

Credit

Dec. 1, 1927, Balance		$6,706.13
Legacy Est. Lucy S. Lord		1,000.00
Legacy Est. Samuel R. Bond		559.73
Donation toward Memorial to Rev. T. F. Waters by Clara B. Dobson		10.00
Sold Anaconda Copper 7's		1,433.00
Sold Pub. Ser. Co. of N. J. rts.		11.75
Sold Elec. Bond & Share rts.		419.64
Transferred from current account		600.00
Paid Edison Electric Ill. Co.		3,000.00
Div. Cent. Ill. Lt.	$105.00	
" Ohio Power	150.00	
" Pub. Ser. N. J.	50.00	
" Pub. Ser. El. & Gas	150.00	
" American Gas & Electric	25.50	
" Atlantic City El.	180.00	
" Electric B. & S.	25.00	
Int. Gandy Bridge	120.00	
" Edison El. Ill.	51.00	
" Peninsular Tel	110.00	
" Ipswich Savings Bank	272.43	
" Anaconda Copper	227.31	
" U. S. Rubber	195.00	
" N. Y. Power & Lt.	90.00	
" Anaconda Copper	41.95	
		1,793.19
		$15,533.44

Debit

Bought New York Power & Light	$1,935.00
" Pub. Service Co. of N. J.	1,103.75
" American Gas & El. rts.	78.00
Adjustment Anaconda Copper	46.00
Withdrawn for Building Acct.	11,912.72
Balance November 30, 1928	457.97
	$15,533.44

CAPITAL ACCOUNT

	Book Value	Market Value
Ipswich Savings Bank	$ 457.97	$ 457.97
25 shares Ohio Power Co. Preferred	2.337.50	2,575.00
25 " Public Service Electric & Gas Pref..	2,383.33	2,687.50
15 " Central Illinois Light Co. Pref....	1,586.25	1,522.50
27 " American Gas & Elec. Co. Common	1,766.83	5,069.25
25 " Electric Bond & Share, Common....	1,878.77	3,562.50
30 " Atlantic City Electric Preferred...	2,550.00	3,240.00
25 " Pub. Service Corp. of N. J. Common	1,100.00	1,840.50
33 " Anaconda Copper Mining	2,059.56	3,683.46
$2,000 Gandy Bridge 6's 1945	2,006.66	1,800.00
$3,000 United States Rubber 6½'s 1936	3,138.04	2,880.00
$2,000 Peninsula Telephone 5'½s 1951	2,000.00	1,990.00
$2,000 New York Power & Light 4½'s 1967..	1,935.00	1,870.00
	$25,199.91	$33,178.68

COST OF MOVING AND REPAIRING WHIPPLE HOUSE

Packing and cataloguing contents	$ 233.05
Contract for moving building	1,300.00
Taking down and rebuilding chimney	1,568.52
Cellar	2,450.73
Carpentry	2,566.78
Painting and glazing	716.02
Plastering	435.13
Heating and plumbing	713.24
Electric wiring	220.77
Grading	785.68
Steps and stone work	286.00
Labor on trees	261.10
Miscellaneous	375.70
	$11,912.72

FORM OF BEQUEST.

I give, devise and bequeath to the Ipswich Historical Society, Inc., the sum of ..... to be applied to the erection and maintenance of a fireproof Memorial Building.

.....

MEMBERS

LIFE MEMBERS

William Sumner Appleton ..... Boston, Mass.
Albert Farwell Bemis ..... Boston Mass.
Ralph W. Burnham ..... Ipswich, Mass.
Richard T. Crane, Jr. ..... Chicago, Ill.
Mrs. Richard T. Crane, Jr. ..... Chicago, Ill.
Cornelius Crane ..... Chicago, Ill.
Florence Crane ..... Chicago, Ill.
Frank C. Farley ..... New York City, N. Y.
Ralph H. Grant ..... Dayton, Ohio
Mrs. Alice R. Hartshorn ..... Taunton, Mass.
Benjamin Kimball ..... Boston, Mass.
John S. Lawrence ..... Boston, Mass.
Miss Katherine Loring ..... Prides Crossing, Mass.
Arthur R. Lord ..... Chicago, Ill.
William G. Low ..... Brooklyn, N. Y.
Mrs. Marietta K. Martin ..... Ipswich, Mass.
Nathan Matthews ..... Boston, Mass.
Mrs. Maud Bemis Parsons ..... Seattle, Wash.
James H. Proctor ..... Ipswich, Mass.
Thomas E. Proctor ..... Topsfield, Mass.
Charles G. Rice ..... Ipswich, Mass.
John L. Saltonstall ..... Topsfield, Mass.
Richard M. Saltonstall ..... Boston, Mass.
Mrs. Charles P. Searle ..... Boston, Mass.
John E. Searle ..... Boston, Mass.
Mrs. Chester P. Seims ..... New York, N. Y.
John Carey Spring ..... Boston, Mass.
Mrs. Julia Appleton Spring ..... Boston, Mass.
Eben B. Symonds ..... Salem, Mass.
Bayard Tuckerman, Jr. ..... Hamilton, Mass.
Mrs. Harold D. Walker ..... Boston, Mass.
Mrs. T. Frank Waters ..... Ipswich, Mass.
Sherman L. Whipple ..... Boston, Mass.

RESIDENT MEMBERS

Reuben Andrews
Mrs. Francis R. Appleton
Francis R. Appleton, Jr.
James W. Appleton
Randolph M. Appleton
Charles Arthur
Mrs. Nellie T. Auger
Eben H. Bailey
Dr. George G. Bailey
John W. Bailey
G. Adrien Barker
Mrs. Kate S. Barnard
Mrs. Julia A. Bird
Mrs. Alice L. Blake
Mrs. Emma B. Bolles
Norman J. Bolles
Mrs. Leone Bracker
A. Story Brown
John A. Brown
Mrs. John A. Brown
Fred A. Brown
Frank M. Burke
Mrs. Nellie M. Burnham
Charles C. Canney
Mrs. Charles C. Canney
Mrs. Genevieve Campbell
David B. Claxton
Edward Cogswell
Miss Harriet D. Condon
Henry Cowles

Mrs. William M. Critchley
Arthur C. Damon
Mrs. Carrie Damon
Mrs. Abbie B. Danforth
Miss Edith L. Daniels
Mrs. Lyman Daniels
Edward L. Darling
Mrs. Howard Dawson
Mrs. Grace Davidson
Miss C. Bertha Dobson
Mrs. Arthur W. Dow
George E. Dow
Mrs. George E. Dow
Howard N. Doughty
Mrs. Howard N. Doughty
Mrs. Charles G. Dyer
Mrs. Emeline F. Farley
George E. Farley
Miss Abbie M. Fellows
Henry Garland
Arthur C. Glover
Charles E. Goodhue
Walter F. Gould
Mrs. Annie T. Grant
Mrs. Ferris Greenslet
George H. W. Hayes
Mrs. George H. W. Hayes
Miss Althea Hayes
Mrs. Maude M. Hayward
Walter E. Hayward
Miss Alice Heard
Wayne Henderson
Joseph I. Horton
Mrs. Caroline E. Horton
Fred R. Hull
E. Everett Johnson
Arthur Johnson
Mrs. Harriett M. Johnson
Miss Ida B. Johnson
Charles M. Kelly
Mrs. Henry Kenyon
Rev. Frederick T. Kenyon
Mrs. Frederick T. Kenyon
Fred A. Kimball
Mrs. Isabel G. Kimball
Robert S. Kimball
Miss Bethiah D. Kinsman
Dr. Frank W. Kyes
Mrs. Georgie C. Kyes
Miss Sarah E. Lakeman
Miss Ellen V. Lang
Mrs. Mary S. Langdon
Arthur L. Lord
Austin L. Lord
Mrs. Mabel R. Lord
Charles L. Lovell
Dr. George E. MacArthur
Mrs. Mary B. Maine
Charles A. Mallard
Edward J. Marcorelle
Mrs. William A. Mitchell
Eben B. Moulton
Miss Eleanor Moulton
Miss Abbie L. Newman
Mrs. Carl Nordstrom
Mrs. Elizabeth B. Norwood
George Parsons
Mrs. George Parsons
Rev. Carroll Perry
Mrs. Walter Poole
Miss Velina A. Porter
Mrs. Charles G. Rice
William J. Riley
Mrs. Francis G. Ross
Mrs. Fred G. Ross
Joseph F. Ross
Mrs. Bertha A. Russell
Angus I. Savory
George A. Schofield
Mrs. Hilda Schofield
Henry S. Spaulding
Miss Alice M. Smith
Mrs. Fannie E. Smith
Miss Lucy B. Story
Mrs. Alice D. Tenny
Ward M. Tenny
R. Elbert Titcomb
Mrs. Miriam W. Titcomb
Miss Nellie Ulrich
Miss Annie G. Wade
Miss Emma E. Wait
Ralph C. Whipple
Mrs. Maud Whipple
Miss Susan C. Whipple
Mrs. Charles M. Wood
Frederick G. Whittier
Mrs. Frederick G. Whittier
Frederick S. Witham
G. Loring Woodbury
Mrs. G. Loring Woodbury

NON-RESIDENT MEMBERS

Frederick J. Alley ..... Hamilton, Mass.
Mrs. Mary G. Alley ..... Hamilton, Mass.
Andrew W. Anthony ..... Boston, Mass.
Mrs. Clara R. Anthony ..... Brookline, Mass.
Harry E. Bailey ..... Boston, Mass.
Dr. J. Dellinger Barney ..... Boston, Mass.
Mrs. J. Dellinger Barney ..... Boston, Mass.
Mrs. Wm. Franklin Barrett ..... Chicago, Ill.
Mrs. William S. Bedal ..... St. Louis, Mo.
Miss E. D. Boardman ..... Boston, Mass.
Miss Clara Breed ..... Washington, D. C.
Miss Mary Brooks ..... Gloucester, Mass.
Albert S. Brown ..... Salem, Mass.
Harry Appleton Brown ..... Lowell, Mass.
F. L. Burke ..... Rowley, Mass.
Frank T. Burnham ..... Charleston, W. Va.
Miss Florence Caldwell ..... Philadelphia, Penn.
John A. Caldwell ..... Winchester, Mass.
Mrs. Elizabeth Carlton ..... Rowley, Mass.
Miss Gertrude Carlton ..... Rowley, Mass.
Mrs. Ruth Lambert Cheny ..... Rowley, Mass.
Miss Florence Cleaves ..... Kittery Point, Me.
Mrs. Mary A. Clark ..... Paterson, N. J.
Harry W. Davis ..... Brookline, Mass.
Mrs. Harry W. Davis ..... Brookline, Mass.
Edward Dearborn ..... Lynn, Mass.
Mrs. Mary B. DeBlois ..... Boston, Mass.
Robert G. Dodge ..... Boston, Mass.
Mrs. Robert G. Dodge ..... Boston, Mass.
Joseph Dodge ..... Lynn, Mass.
William W. Emerson ..... Haverhill, Mass.
Mrs. William W. Emerson ..... Haverhill, Mass.
Miss Ruth L. Emerson ..... Haverhill, Mass.
Miss Frances Farley ..... Marblehead, Mass.
Sylvanus C. Farley ..... Alton, Ill.
Mrs. Eunice W. Felton ..... Cambridge, Mass.
Mrs. Pauline S. Fenno ..... Rowley, Mass.
F. Appleton Flichtner ..... Southboro, Mass.
William E. Foster ..... Providence, R. I.
Mrs. William E. Foster ..... Providence, R. I.
Amos Tuck French ..... New York, N. Y.
Mrs. Harriet Frothingham ..... Boston, Mass.
Mrs. Frederick Galacar ..... Boston, Mass.
Mrs. Alva H. Gilman ..... Plainfield, N. J.
Dr. J. L. Goodale ..... Boston, Mass.
Mrs. Amy M. Haggerty ..... Baltimore, Md.
Arthur W. Hale ..... Winchester, Mass.
Mrs. Francis B. Harrington ..... Boston, Mass.
Clarence L. Hay ..... Newbury, N. H.
Mrs. Clarence L. Hay ..... Newbury, N. H.
Mrs. Robert Haydock ..... Hewlett, L. I.
Mrs. James R. Hooper ..... Boston, Mass.
Lawrence M. Horton ..... Lexington, Mass.

Dr. Howard C. Jewett .....Haverhill, Mass.
Miss Harriet L. Jewett .....Haverhill, Mass.
Alfred V. Kidder .....Andover, Mass.
Mrs. Alfred V. Kidder .....Andover, Mass.
Arthur S. Kimball .....Oberlin, Ohio
Mrs. Laura U. Kohn .....New York, N. Y.
Curtis E. Lakeman .....Larchmont, N. J.
Mrs. William L. Lyons .....Lexington, Ky.
Mrs. May W. Lester .....Hartford, Conn.
Mrs. Mary A. Lord .....New York, N. Y.
Mrs. Samuel M. Magoffin .....St. Paul, Minn.
Mrs. Frances E. Markoe .....Pennlyn, Penn.
Mrs. Sarah L. Marsh .....Lynn, Mass.
Miss Helen Mills .....Kent, Conn.
Benjamin P. P. Moseley .....Boston, Mass.
Mrs. Benjamin P. P. Moseley .....Boston, Mass.
Dr. Robert B. Osgood .....Boston, Mass.
Robert S. Perdue .....Cleveland, Ohio
Agar Ludlow Perkins .....Brooklyn, N. Y.
Augustus N. Rantoul .....Boston, Mass.
A. Davidson Remick .....Boston, Mass.
Albert Robinson .....New York
James S. Robinson .....Boston, Mass.
Mrs. James S. Robinson .....Boston, Mass.
Derby Rogers .....New Canaan, Conn.
Francis Rogers .....New York, N. Y.
Miss Susan Rogers .....Boston, Mass.
Mrs. Albert G. Ropes .....New York, N. Y.
Arthur Shurtleff .....Boston, Mass.
Miss Alice G. Smith .....Concord, Mass.
Henry P. Smith .....Brookline, Mass.
Mrs. Caroline P. Smith .....Brookline, Mass.
Mrs. Martha E. Smith .....Winchester, Mass.
Theo. W. Smith .....Winchester, Mass.
Mrs. Theo. W. Smith .....Winchester, Mass.
Harry C. Spiller .....Boston, Mass.
Mrs. George B. Stone .....Everett, Mass.
Mrs. Charles Sprague .....Boston, Mass.
Miss Mabel Taggart .....Cambridge, Mass.
Dr. E. W. Taylor .....Boston, Mass.
Mrs. Arthur P. Tenney .....Haverhill, Mass.
Rev. William G. Thayer .....Southboro, Mass.
Dr. Charles W. Townsend .....Boston, Mass.
Dr. Ira O. Tracy .....Brooklyn, N. Y.
Frank H. Trussell .....Hamilton, Mass.
Mrs. Annie Tuckerman .....New York, N. Y.
Miss Marion Thomas .....Portland, Ore.
Isaac Rand Thomas .....Boston, Mass.
Mrs. Isaac Rand Thomas .....Boston, Mass.
Harry W. Tyler .....Boston, Mass.
Dr. Herman F. Vickery .....Boston, Mass.
Mrs. Herman F. Vickery .....Boston, Mass.
Langdon Warner .....Philadlphia, Penn.

Roger Sherman Warner ..... Boston, Mass.
George F. Waters ..... Fall River, Mass.
Mrs. William West ..... Salem, Mass.
Miss Grace Weymouth ..... Cleveland, Ohio
Mrs. Sarah E. Wheeler ..... Concord, Mass.
Mrs. C. W. Whipple ..... New York, N. Y.
Dr. George H. Whipple ..... Rocheser, N. Y.
Henry C. Whipple ..... Bristol, N. H.
Henry W. Whipple ..... Cranford, N. J.
Mrs. Henry W. Whipple ..... Cranford, N. J.
Sherman L. Whipple, Jr. ..... Webser, Mass.
Sherman L. Whipple, 3rd ..... Webster, Mass.
T. H. Bailey Whipple ..... East Pittsburg, Pa.
Frederick L. Winthrop ..... Boston, Mass.
Mrs. Sybil A. Wolcott ..... Hamilton, Mass.
Chalmers Wood, Jr. ..... New York, N. Y.
Chester P. Woodbury ..... Boston, Mass.
Joseph F. Woods ..... Boston, Mass.

HONORARY MEMBERS

John Albree, Sr. ..... Swampscott, Mass.
Mrs. Katherine S. Farley ..... South Manchester, Conn.
Reginald Foster ..... Boston, Mass.
Miss Alice A. Gray ..... Sauquoit, N. Y.
Miss Emily R. Gray ..... Sauquoit, N. Y.
Albert Farley Heard, 2nd ..... Boston, Mass.
Mrs. Otis S. Kimball ..... Boston, Mass.
Miss Sarah S. Kimball ..... Salem, Mass.
Henry S. Manning ..... New York, N. Y.
Mrs. Mary W. Manning ..... New York, N. Y.
Miss Esther Parmenter ..... Chicopee, Mass.
Denison R. Slade ..... Brookline, Mass.
Joseph Spiller ..... Boston, Mass.
Miss Ellen M. Stone ..... East Lexington, Mass.
W. F. Warner ..... St. Louis, Mo.

The Ipswich Historical Society was organized in 1890, and incorporated in 1898. It has purchased and restored to its original architecture the ancient house it now occupies, one of the finest specimens of the early Colonial style. It has issued a series of Publications which have now reached to No. XXVII, which are of general interest.

We wish to commend our work and our needs to our own citizens, to those who make their summer home with us, to all scattered throughout our land, who have an ancestral connection with the old Town, and to any who incline to help us. We can use large funds wisely in sustaining the Society, and erecting and endowing our new building, and in establishing a permanent endowment.

Our membership is of two kinds: an Annual Membership, with yearly dues of $2.00, which entitles to a copy of the Publications as they are issued and free entrance to our House with friends; and a Life Membership, with a single payment of $50.00, which entitles to all the privileges of membership.

Names may be sent at any time to the President. Orders for the Publications, sent to the Secretary, will be filled at once.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE IPSWICH HISTORICAL SOCIETY

I. The Oration by Rev. Washington Choate and the Poem by Rev. Edgar F. Davis, on the 200th Anniversary of the Resistance to the Andros Tax, 1887.

II, III, IV and VI. Out of print.

V. Reprinted in No. XXVII.

VII. "John Winthrop the Younger." Board covers, price $2.50.

VIII. "The Development of our Town Government," and "Common Lands and Commonage," with Proceedings at the Annual Meeting, 1899. 50 cents.

IX. "A History of the Old Argilla Road in Ipswich, Massachusetts," by Thomas Franklin Waters. 50 cents.

X. Reprinted in No. XX.

XI. "The Meeting House Green and a Study of Houses and Lands in that Vicinity," with Proceedings at the Annual Meeting, December 2, 1901. 50 cents.

XII. "Thomas Dudley and Simon and Ann Bradstreet." A Study of House Lots to Determine the Location of Their Homes, and the Exercises at the Dedication of Tablets, July 31, 1902, with Proceedings at the Annual Meeting, December 1, 1902. 50 cents.

XIII. "Fine Thread, Lace and Hosiery in Ipswich," by Joseph Fewkes, and "Ipswich Mills and Factories," by Thomas Franklin Waters, with Proceedings at the Annual Meeting. 50 cents.

XV. "The Simple Cobler of Aggawam," by Rev. Nathaniel Ward. A reprint of the 4th Edition, published in 1647, with facsimile of title page, preface and headlines, and the exact text, and an Essay, "Nathaniel Ward and the Simple Cobler," by Thomas Franklin Waters, 116 pp., 75 cents, postage 10 cents. A limited edition, printed on heavy paper, bound in boards, price $1.50, postage prepaid.

XV. "The Old Bay Road from Saltonstall's Brook and Samuel Appleton's Farm," and "A Genealogy of the Ipswich Descendants of Samuel Appleton," by Thomas Franklin Waters, with Proceedings at the Annual Meeting. Price 75 cents.

XVI and XVII. Double number. "Candlewood; An Ancient Neighborhood in Ipswich." With Genealogies of John Brown, 39 pp., William Fellows, 47 pp., and Robert Kinsman, 15 pp. 160 pp., octavo, with maps, full page illustrations and complete index, by Thomas Franklin Waters. Price $1.50. Postage, 8 cents.

XVIII. "Jeffrey's Neck and the Way Leading Thereto," with Notes on Little Neck. 93 pp., octavo, by Tohmas Franklin Waters. 50 cents.

XIX. "Ipswich Village and the Old Rowley Road." 76 pages, octavo, by Thomas Franklin Waters. 50 cents.

XX. "The John Whipple House in Ipswich, Mass., and the People Who Have Owned and Lived In It." 55 pages, octavo, by Thomas Franklin Waters. 50 cents.

XXI. "Augustine Heard and His Friends (Joseph Green Cogswell and Daniel Treadwell)." 120 pages, octavo, by Thomas Franklin Waters. Board covers, heavy paper, $1.50 and postage (14 cents).

XXII. "Plum Island, Ipswich, Mass." Its earliest history, original land grants, land ownership, marshes and thatch banks, beaches and sand dunes. Illustrated, with maps and many photographs of the island scenery. 64 pages, octavo, by Thomas Franklin Waters. Price 75 cents.

XXIII. "Ipswich in the World War." 237 pages, with war records and photographs of veterans. Price $2.00.

XXIV. "Ipswich River—Its Bridges, Wharves and Industries." 40 pages. 75 cents.

XXV. "Glimpses of Everyday Life in Old Ipswich." 40 pages. 50 cents.

XXVI. "Two Ipswich Patriots." 40 pages. 75 cents.

XXVII. "Puritan Homes." 100 pages.

Ips.Rm.Bay
974.4513
Ipswich
no.27

IPSWICH PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 2122 00082 8735

ALSO PUBLISHED UNDER THE AUSPICES OF
THE IPSWICH HISTORICAL SOCIETY

IPSWICH
IN THE
MASSACHUSETTS BAY COLONY

BY

THOMAS FRANKLIN WATERS

VOLUME I
1633-1700

PART I. The History of Ipswich to the Year 1700.

PART II. The Land Grants from the Beginning to 1905.

586 Pages, Octavo, Gilt Top with Maps.
Full Page Illustrations and Full Index.

VOLUME II

The History of the Town from 1700 to 1917.

840 Pages, Octavo, Gilt Top, 40 Full Page Illustrations and Full Index.

Price $7.50 for each volume,
with Parcel Post.

Orders may be sent to the Secretary of the Ipswich Historical Society.

The Rogers Room
Reference
Ipswich Public Library
Ipswich, Massachusetts

Reference
Copy 2

APR 9 '70

Ipswich Public Library
Ipswich, Massachusetts